DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 658 EA 020 871

AUTHOR Barnette, J. Jackson; Sattes, Beth D.
TITLE Opinions about the Tennessee Career Ladder: A Statewide Survey of Tennessee Administrators. A Joint Study.
INSTITUTION Appalachia Educational Lab., Charleston, W. Va.; Tennessee Association for School Supervision and Administration.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Oct 88
CONTRACT 400-86-0001
NOTE 91p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications, Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc., P.O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325 ($8.00 prepaid).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Career Ladders; *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Management Development; *Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS *Tennessee

ABSTRACT

In November 1987, 1,200 Tennessee administrators out of 2,800 surveyed by mail offered their opinions about Administrator Career Ladder--a new program implemented in spring 1985 as part of the State's Comprehensive Education Reform Act. Results show that educators are split over the advisability of this undertaking. Survey responses varied consistently by position and by career-ladder status. Generally, superintendents and other administrators in the upper career-ladder levels responded more positively than did lower echelon administrators. Throughout Tennessee, more administrators have chosen not to seek higher career-ladder status than have opted to participate in the system. Overall, the school administrators surveyed do not perceive that the career-ladder program has improved Tennessee schools--the original intent of the program. However, a majority of administrators believe that the career ladder has positively influenced specific aspects of education by providing opportunities for extended contracts, professional growth, leadership, classroom teaching, public financial support, and student achievement. Based on survey results, the study group has advanced several recommendations concerning program improvement, the evaluation process, personnel eligibility, salary, and research needs. The report includes 31 tables and 3 appendices: (1) survey questions generated by the study group; (2) the career-ladder survey; and (3) respondent group characteristics. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED307658

TASSA-AEL

Opinions About the Tennessee Career Ladder: A Statewide Survey of Tennessee Administrators

A Joint Study by the

Tennessee Association for School Supervision and Administration

and the

AEL

Appalachia Educational Laboratory
P. O. Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325

October 1988

EA 020 871

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marilyn Slack

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Opinions About the Tennessee Career Ladder: A Statewide Survey of Tennessee Administrators

Report Written By:
J. Jackson Barnette, Memphis State University
and
Beth D. Sattes, AEL

A Joint Study Conducted By:

TASSA
Tennessee Association for School Supervision and Administration

and

AEL
Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
Charleston, West Virginia

October 1988

Funded by the

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U. S. Department of Education
Washington, D. C.

The Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL), Inc., works with educators in ongoing R & D-based efforts to improve education and educational opportunity. AEL serves as the Regional Educational Laboratory for Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. It also operates the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. AEL works to improve:

- professional quality,
- curriculum and instruction,
- community support, and
- opportunity for access to quality education by all children.

Information about AEL projects, programs, and services is available by writing or calling **AEL**, Post Office Box 1348, Charleston, West Virginia 25325; 800/624-9120 (outside WV), 800/344-6646 (in WV), and 347-0400 (local).

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number 400-86-0001. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U. S. Government.

These materials are issued in draft form for developmental purposes.

AEL is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer.

Acknowledgements

The TASSA-AEL study on the Tennessee Career Ladder has been the result of efforts by many people. Both organizations contributed financial support to the study. Over 1,200 administrators from across the state participated by completing and returning the written survey. Twenty-two TASSA members and AEL staff served on the original study group to develop potential questions for the statewide survey. All members are listed on the next page. Several deserve special recognition.

Sandra Orletsky, from AEL, and John H. Jones, from TASSA, provided leadership throughout the entire 18-month effort. A special thanks to Sandra, who kept reminding us of the task that lay ahead and who found creative ways to overcome potential barriers to completing the study.

Jo Gateley, then-president of TASSA, recruited help from students at Trezevant Vocational-Technical Center, where she is principal. Under Jo's management, 2,800 surveys were folded, stamped, and mailed. Without Jo's help, we could never have processed the data from the 1,200 completed surveys. Vocational students assisted by keypunching all the responses.

J. Jackson Barnette analyzed the data. Jack's thorough analysis allowed the group to reach conclusions with confidence. He and Beth Sattes studied the data, summarized the results, and wrote the report.

Milton West chaired the original meeting, wrote the first draft of a survey for the study, and presented the findings at a meeting of the Tennessee State Certification Commission and at an AEL conference.

A study group subcommittee met four times to do much of the work of the study. This group was composed, at various times, of the following people: Jack Barnette, Vernon Brooks, Jo Gateley, Peggy Harris, Juanita Henson, John Jones, Sandra Orletsky, Bill Sapp, Beth Sattes, Bobby Snider, and Milton West. Assistance was provided by George Malo from the Tennessee Department of Education.

Patricia Cahape edited the written report and, with typesetting and layout, she and Carolyn Luzader, both of AEL, helped to make the report easier to read--both in the wording and in the presentation of the words.

TASSA-AEL Study Group

Vernon Brooks, Principal
Riverside Elementary School
Carter Street
Columbia, TN 38401

Tom Bruce
Route 1
Long Hollow Pike
Hendersonville, TN 37075

Paul Decker
201 E. Main Street
Hendersonville, TN 37075

Donald Embry, Ph.D.
Superintendent
Tullahoma City Schools
510 South Jackson Street
Tullahoma, TN 37388

Jo Gateley
Trezevant Vocational School
3224 Range Line Road
Memphis, TN 38127

Sandra Harper
P. O. Box D
Dyer, TN 38330

Peggy Harris
Metro Nashville Public Schools
2601 Bransford Avenue, Rm. C, 407A
Nashville, TN 37219

Raybon M. Hawkins, Sr.
P. O. Box 14229
Memphis, TN 38114

Juanita Henson
Rt. 2, Box 742
Ethridge, TN 38456

Merrol N. Hyde
103 Rebecca Drive
Hendersonville, TN 37075

John Jones, Ph.D.
Superintendent
Murfreesboro City Schools
P. O. Box 279
Murfreesboro, TN 37177-0279

Mark Massey
280 South Oak
Adamsville, TN 38310

Robert McElrath, Ph.D.
College of Education
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, TN 37614

Sandra Orletsky
AEL

Billy J. Pack
209 East McLean
Manchester, TN 37355

William Proctor
4783 Elvis Presley Boulevard
Memphis, TN 38116

Steve Ramsey
Rt. 2, Box 318B
Martin, TN 38237

William Sapp
Sycamore Middle School
Old Dirt Pike
Pleasant View, TN 37146

Beth Sattes
AEL

Mike Simmons, Ph.D.
Superintendent
Johnson City Schools
P. O. Box 1517
Johnson City, TN 36761

Bobby Snider
Henderson County Schools
P. O. Box 190
Lexington, TN 38351

Larry Vick
Superintendent
Paris Special School District
402 Lee Street
Paris, TN 38242

Milton West
Union City Schools
P. O. Box 749
Union City, TN 38261

Abstract

Background

In November of 1987, the Tennessee Association for School Supervision and Administration (TASSA) and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) surveyed administrators across the state of Tennessee to learn their opinions about the Administrator Career Ladder. TASSA, as an umbrella organization for educational administrators, was interested in its membership's reactions to the Career Ladder--a new program that had been implemented in the spring of 1985 as part of a much larger reform effort in Tennessee, the Comprehensive Education Reform Act.

Any new innovation or change brings with it initial resistance and negative reactions--and this is especially true for a program like the Career Ladder, which has such important personal consequences (e.g., salary supplements, evaluations, and peer review.) Throughout its short lifetime, Tennessee's Career Ladder has had its share of outspoken opponents and proponents. From the first mention of the idea, educators have been split over the advisability of such an undertaking. The survey results confirm that these splits in opinion still exist.

Results

Divided Opinions

Responses to most of the survey questions varied consistently by position and by Career Ladder status. Overall, superintendents in Tennessee had more positive views about the Administrator Career Ladder than did other administrators. Evidently, superintendents, as a group, see more positive potential to be derived for education from the system of Career Ladder and merit pay.

Another group whose responses were consistently more positive than the group as a whole toward the Administrator Career Ladder were administrators on the upper levels of the Career Ladder. As might be expected, those who have chosen not to participate on the upper levels of the ladder have more negative views. Throughout Tennessee, there are more administrators who have chosen not to participate than there are those who have chosen to participate in the upper levels of the Career Ladder; consequently, the average response to the survey is weighted toward the negative.

In general, Career Ladder I status respondents are administrators who were required to get Career Ladder certification and who chose NOT to participate in the upper levels of the Career

Ladder. Prior to July 1987, participation on the Career Ladder was mandatory for all eligible administrators. Administrators obtained Career Ladder I status merely by passing a local district evaluation.

To obtain the upper levels of Career Ladder has always been voluntary, but it requires passing a fairly complex state-administered evaluation process. Of those who have applied for the higher levels and completed all evaluation visits, between 93% and 94% were successful and obtained either Level II or III status. Many applied for Level III and obtained Level II.

The results from the survey have been interpreted in light of the fact that status on the Career Ladder in one sense distinguishes between voluntary participants (Level II and III) and nonparticipants in the upper levels of Career Ladder (Level I and non-Career Ladder). One group has an "outsiders" perspective; the other views the system from having participated in it. This same difference in opinion between (more positive) participating and (more negative) nonparticipating teachers was reported in a study done for the Arizona Career Ladder Research and Evaluation Project. In that report, as in this, "the slightly negative trends in the results can be attributed largely to nonparticipants."(p.6)

Some specific results. There is strong feeling--both positive and negative--about whether or not the state should remain on the Career Ladder system. Forty-six percent of the respondents felt Tennessee should not return to a system based on training and experience only; 40 percent thought Tennessee should return to a system that excludes incentive or merit pay. Superintendents and administrators on the upper levels of the Career Ladder, quite predictably, were the groups who were the strongest opponents of Tennessee's returning to a system based solely on years of experience and years of training.

Overall, the data suggest that school administrators do not perceive that the Career Ladder program has improved Tennessee schools, which was the original intent of the Career Ladder program. This perception is in some conflict with opinions to another question, in which a majority of administrators believe that the Career Ladder has had a positive effect on specific aspects of education in Tennessee, such as providing opportunities for extended contracts, professional growth, leadership, classroom teaching, public financial support, and student achievement. Again, as a group, superintendents and administrators on the upper levels of the Career Ladder believe more strongly that the Career Ladder is helping to improve schools.

Speaking With One Voice

Administrators believe that all certified school personnel should be eligible to apply for the Career Ladder. They agreed

(82%) that educators who move to non-Career Ladder positions should be able to maintain their Career Ladder supplements.

Most administrators are neutral or disagree with the notion that the Career Ladder evaluation process accurately reflects performance or that it differentiates among degrees of excellence. They do not believe that the most competent administrators have necessarily applied for or attained the upper levels of the Career Ladder.

However much they think the evaluation process is lacking, though, administrators believe that evaluation should be a part of achieving upper levels of the Career Ladder. Administrators also believe that years of experience should be a part of the eligibility criteria to upper levels of the Career Ladder. That the evaluation process can be improved seems to be without question. Some of the improvements administrators seemed to support are listed below.

- Evaluations for Career Levels II and III should involve more local input.
- Shorten the evaluation system to one semester.
- Include how well administrators evaluate teachers as a part of the overall process of evaluating administrators. (NOTE: This change has been implemented by the Board of Education since this study was completed in January 1988.)
- Retain existing evaluation instruments with the possible exceptions of the student questionnaire and the administrator portfolio.

The results of the survey point to support for the Administrators' Academy. Administrators (68%) agreed that attendance should be required--especially for those on the Career Ladder. More than half believed all administrators (even those NOT on Career Ladder) should be required to attend. (NOTE: Attendance at the Academy has always been mandatory for administrators.)

Most survey questions pertained to the Administrator Career Ladder, but one item focused on the role of administrators in the Teacher Career Ladder. According to 74 percent of respondents, local school administrators should be a part of a state evaluation team for evaluating teachers for Career Levels II and III. (NOTE: Since the survey has been completed, this change has been made. Teachers can request that the local school administrator be a part of the state evaluation team.)

Regarding local options for administration of the extended contracts and salary supplements, administrators tended to agree that there should be statewide consistency. Administrators believe that attendance at the Academy should count toward extended contract time. (NOTE: This has always been an option for local education agencies.) They also believe that all money should be

passed on to local school administrators.

Recommendations

Based on the results of the survey, the TASSA-AEL study group formed the following recommendations. Some of these, as noted in the text above, have already been acted upon by the State Board of Education. Others have already received some consideration, and the study group members hope that these recommendations will help to formulate positive changes in the Career Ladder system in the state of Tennessee.

1. The Administrator Career Ladder program should be continued and improved.
2. Upper levels of the Career Ladder should continue to be earned through an evaluation process. The evaluation system should be changed to include the following:
   A. Shorten the evaluation cycle from one year to one semester.
   B. Add a new component to measure the administrator's effectiveness in evaluating teachers.
   C. Increase the amount of local input for upper level evaluations for administrators.
3. Retain most of the instruments in the current evaluation system. However, because there are mixed opinions about the retention of the portfolio and the student questionnaire, evaluate the continued use of the portfolio and the student questionnaire as data sources in the career ladder evaluation system.
4. Career Ladder programs should be developed and established for all certified school personnel.
5. The state should continue its support of Administrators' Academies. Attendance at the academies should count as extended contract time.
6. Give attention to across-the-board salary increases, and provide uniformity in the administration of Career Ladder extended contract monies.
7. Continue to conduct research for the improvement of the Career Ladder program.

Summary

In November 1987, 1,200 administrators from across the state of Tennessee completed a survey, in which they gave their opinions about the Administrator Career Ladder, a new innovation first implemented in the spring of 1985 in Tennessee. The results of the study do not point to clear and unanimous support for the Career Ladder. Responses had high variability into both ends of the scale indicating that school administrators either like the Career Ladder or they dislike the Career Ladder; they either believe it is having positive effects, or they think it has negative consequences. The average of their responses may be near the

neutral point, but their individual responses are not neutral.

These results confirm findings reported by the Southern Regional Education Board's Career Ladder Clearinghouse in a December 1987 article, "More Pay for Teachers and Administrators Who Do More: Incentive Pay Programs, 1987." In that summary, the author, Lynn Cornett, points out that:

> ...career ladders deal with fundamental changes. Fundamental changes in any situation--in business, in government, or in the schools--make for strong reactions.... If there were no strong reactions to an incentive program as it was implemented, that would signal that the program was bringing about no real change and was dealing with important issues only at the surface. States and school districts should weigh negative reactions and suggestions for modifications in their plans that may spring from this dissatisfaction. (p. 1)

For additional information, or to obtain a copy of a more detailed report, contact TASSA, Bobby Snider, P. O. Box 190, Lexington, TN 38351; 901/968-6374 or AEL, P. O. Box 1348, Charleston, West Virginia 25325; 800/624-9120 (outside WV); 800/344-6646 (in WV); 347-0400 (local).

Table of Contents

BACKGROUND: HISTORY AND PERSPECTIVE..... page 1
Selecting a Study Group..... page 1
Forming the TASSA-AEL Study Group..... page 1
Analysis of Data: A Guide to Understanding the Results..... page 2

RESULTS..... page 5
I. Characteristics of Respondents..... page 5
II. Perceptions About the Overall Effect of the Administrator Career Ladder on Schooling and School People..... page 6
• Section 4..... page 6
• Other Items..... page 9
III. Administrators' Perceptions Regarding the Implementation of the Career Ladder Program..... page 14
• Involvement of Intended Participants..... page 15
• Evaluation of Career Ladder Participants..... page 18
–Effectiveness and timeliness of evaluation..... page 18
–Local involvement in evaluation..... page 19
–Criteria used for career ladder involvement and placement..... page 24
–Instrumentation used for evaluation..... page 28
• Extended Contracts..... page 31
IV. Administrators' Perceptions Regarding a Variety of Incentive Programs..... page 34
V. Summary of Results..... page 39

CONCLUSIONS ..... page 43

RECOMMENDATIONS..... page 47

APPENDICES
Appendix A ..... Nominal Group Process
Appendix B ..... TASSA-AEL Tennessee Career Ladder Survey
Appendix C ..... Selected Tables
A.1 - Characteristics of Respondent Group
A.2 - Contributions of Career Ladder Program
A.3 - Results for Retention of Administrator Career Ladder Evaluation Insruments

Background: History and Perspective

Selecting a Study Group Topic

In the spring of 1987, AEL staff approached the Tennessee Association for School Supervision and Administration (TASSA) Executive Board about selecting a topic appropriate for a statewide study group. AEL promised technical assistance and limited financial assistance in exchange for a commitment from selected TASSA members to work on the study group. AEL had only two restrictions relating to the choice of the topic. First, the topic should be related to AEL's mission statement (of improving education and educational opportunity) and as such should have the potential for improving the quality of education and educational opportunity for children in Tennessee. Second, the topic should be research-amenable; that is, the study group's process of study was to include some research design or utilization of research findings. This would help meet one of AEL's objectives to increase educators' use of research to solve educational problems and issues.

The TASSA Executive Board had little difficulty selecting a topic: to assess administrators' perspectives of the new statewide Career Ladder Program. Tennessee had recently undergone massive school reform legislation that included, among many new initiatives, the Teacher and Administrator Career Ladder Programs. This great wave of change had spread across the state with varying degrees of acceptance among educators. The change brought about by such a massive reform effort was disquieting--even for those who supported the basic programs. TASSA felt that it was an appropriate time to take the pulse of school administrators and determine their mood in regard to the issue of the statewide Career Ladder Programs.

Forming the TASSA-AEL Study Group

As the TASSA-AEL study group was formed, members were carefully selected to serve. The study group was composed of representative administrators--superintendents, principals, supervisors, and others--from large and small school districts in geographic regions of Tennessee. Members had an interest in the topic and were willing to devote time and energy to the project.

At the Executive Committee meeting where the topic was first discussed, a basic plan had emerged: that the study group would conduct a survey of state administrators. The first task of the study group itself, then, was to design the survey instrument. In Nashville, preceding a TASSA annual conference in June 1987, the study group met. AEL staff helped to conduct the Nominal Group Process to elicit group opinion about the questions to be posed on the survey instrument. (See a description of the Nominal Group Process in Appendix A.) The nominal question posed to study group

members, "What questions would you like to ask Tennessee administrators about the Career Ladder?," prompted a wealth of responses.

AEL staff and the committee chair drafted the first version of the survey. A subcommittee met in Memphis during October to revise the survey. (See copy of the survey in Appendix B.)

Study group members pilot tested and revised the instrument in the fall of 1987. During November 1987, TASSA mailed the survey to all 2,800 Tennessee administrators; 1,200 surveys were returned for a response rate of 43%.

TASSA employed a consultant, J. Jackson Barnette, a Memphis State University professor of evaluation, who analyzed the survey data.* At a January 1988 meeting, Barnette presented preliminary results to a subcommittee from the TASSA-AEL study group. After this meeting, two members presented these initial findings at the Tennessee State Certification Commission hearing in late January. During the spring and summer of 1988, further analyses were conducted by Barnette and AEL staff.

Selected members of the TASSA-AEL study group reviewed two revisions of the report of findings. At a concluding meeting in September 1988, the study group agreed on final conclusions and recommendations. They also developed a dissemination plan for the study group document, which was edited and printed by AEL. Both TASSA and AEL will disseminate the findings of the study.

Analysis of Data: A Guide to Understanding the Results

The results of the study do not point to clear and unanimous support for the Career Ladder. Although the average opinion of school administrators tends toward neutrality or in some cases toward a negative response, one must be careful in interpreting what the "average" response means. In many cases, responses had high variability into both ends of the scale. Depicting survey data by subgroups indicates that responses vary, in some cases dramatically, according to that subpopulation being analyzed and to the number of respondents within subpopulation categories.

That the average response is near neutral does not mean that administrators have no opinion about this issue. School administrators either like the Career Ladder or they dislike the Career Ladder; they generally believe it is having positive effects, or they think it has negative consequences. The average of their responses may be near the neutral point; but their individual responses are not neutral.

---

*Some of the survey questions asked administrators for perceptions about the Teacher Carrer Ladder as well as the Administrator Career Ladder. Administrators' perceptions about the Teacher Career Ladder have been analyzed; however this report is limited to data about perceptions related to the Administrator Career Ladder.

These results confirm findings reported by the Southern Regional Education Board's Career Ladder Clearinghouse in a December 1987 publication, *More Pay for Teachers and Administrators Who Do More: Incentive Pay Programs, 1987*. In that summary, the author, Lynn Cornett, points out that

> ...career ladders deal with fundamental changes. Fundamental changes in any situation--in business, in government, or in the schools--make for strong reactions.... If there were no strong reactions to an incentive program as it was implemented, that would signal that the program was bringing about no real change and was dealing with important issues only at the surface. States and school districts should weigh negative reactions and suggestions for modifications in their plans that may spring from this dissatisfaction. (p. 1)

The consultant who analyzed the TASSA-AEL study group data prepared complete tables for every question. He tabulated responses for every question by the following variables: sex, current administrative assignment, position, work setting (rural, small city, suburban, or urban), region of state, years of administrative experience, years of experience in education, Career Ladder status, and highest Career Ladder level for which they had been evaluated. A technical report containing all these complete tables is available, upon request, from AEL's School Governance and Administration program.

The tables in this report contain information by variable only when the variable appeared to account for differences in administrators' opinions. Two variables are referred to repeatedly throughout this report. The first is the variable of "position." Within this variable, administrators could label themselves as principal, assistant principal, superintendent, instructional supervisor, or other. Superintendents consistently responded differently than other administrators. Their views were generally more positive about the Career Ladder.

The second variable where consistent differences were observed is "certification" or Career Ladder status. Administrators of Levels II and III consistently responded differently than did administrators of Career Level I or provisional status or those not on the Career Ladder. It is important to note that higher level status on the Career Ladder was associated with more positive perceptions about the Career Ladder.

It would be helpful, at this point, for the reader to understand more about participation on the Administrator Career Ladder. Not all administrators are eligible to apply for the Career Ladder and participation is optional for those who are eligible. But prior to July 1987, participation was not optional; it was mandatory for those who were eligible. That is, up until July 1987, all eligible administrators were required to get Career Level certification.

The original requirements to obtain Career Level I were minimal. Depending on their local districts, many administrators obtained Career Level I status merely by "signing up," attending training, and passing a local district evaluation process--for which effort they were rewarded by a $1000 salary supplement.

It has always been more complex to obtain the upper levels of Career Ladder. An administrator must pass the state-administered evaluation process. Participation is not mandatory. However, most who have applied for upper levels to date have been successful. That is, of those who applied for the higher levels and completed all evaluation visits, between 93% and 94% obtained either Level II or III status. The evaluation process for upper level status is time-consuming; it is rewarded with substantial salary supplements.

In general, survey respondents who rated themselves as Career Ladder I status administrators constitute a group who, for the most part, elected to meet only the rudimentary requirements of Career Ladder certification and who chose NOT to participate in the upper levels of the Career Ladder. As the data are reported throughout this report, it is important to keep in mind that status on Career Ladder may actually be distinguishing between voluntary participants in the upper levels of Career Ladder (Level I and non-Career Ladder). It is not surprising that those who did not participate--either by choice (i.e., the Level I respondents) or by virtue of their position (i.e., the non-Career Ladder administrators)--are more negative about the Career Ladder than are those who have chosen to participate and are obtaining some financial benefits as a consequence.

These findings are supported by those of a similar study--of teachers rather than administrators--*Descriptive and Analytical Results for the 1986-87 Career Ladder Data Cycles* by Dr. Richard D. Packard, Manager of the Arizona Career Ladder Research and Evaluation Project, in a report presented to the Joint Legislative Committee on Career Ladder Programs, Arizona State Capitol, November 1987. In that report's summary, they write:

> ...shows an extreme difference in agreement with career ladder concepts among those teachers on the ladder, nonparticipants in the program and those applying, but not yet placed. In many cases, there was a range from 20 to 30 percentage points between teachers on the ladder and nonparticipants, with those not participating usually quite negative about program concepts, while participants were found to normally be very positive. Implications were, that the slightly negative trends ...can largely be attributed to nonparticipants. (p. 6)

Indeed, in the present study, differences between Career Level I and Level III respondents are as much as 30 to 50 percentage points. If one considers Career Level I administrators to be primarily "nonparticipants," then these findings are in line with those from the Arizona study.

Results

This report presents results of the study in five sections. Section I reports the demographics of the 1,200 respondents. Section II reports administrators' perceptions about the overall effects of the Administrator Career Ladder Program on schooling and school people. Section III reports how administrators perceive individual aspects of the program, including instrumentation, effectiveness in involving intended participants, and the extended contract option that is available to administrators at the upper level of the Career Ladder. Section IV summarizes administrators' views on a wide range of incentive programs (including Career Ladder) for teachers and administrators. Section V summarizes the significant results reported throughout Sections II, III, and IV.

Characteristics of Respondents

The TASSA-AEL survey instrument asked for background information about the respondents. Results revealed that the group who responded was approximately representative of the total population of school administrators in Tennessee.

Career Ladder Status	Number in State as of 8/87	Number of Survey Respondents as of 11/87
	(Percent is shown as percent of those in Career Level I, II, or III)	
Career Level I	1,191 (56%)	550 (55%)
Career Level II	173 (8%)	67 (7%)
Career Level III	755 (36%)	380 (38%)

NOTE: Not all Tennessee administrators are eligible for any Career Ladder certification.

The Tennessee State Department of Education had figures indicating that 2,119 administrators were on one of the three Career Ladder levels, as of August 1987. (See the figures above.) This represents 76% of the total number of administrators in Tennessee, using the figure of 2,800--the number of surveys mailed by TASSA--as the total number of administrators. Of the 1,204 respondents, 997 (or 83%) were on one of the Career Ladder levels. This means that the survey respondents were slightly more representative of those on the Career Ladder than is the total population of administrators.

Further demographics of the respondents show the following about Tennessee administrators:

- two-thirds were male;
- a third (37%) worked in elementary schools, about a quarter (23%) worked in secondary schools, another quarter (28%) worked in central office, and 10% worked in other settings;
- over half (55%) were principals, 3% were assistant principals, 4% were superintendents, a fifth (19%) were instructional supervisors, and the rest held other administrative positions;
- nearly half (45%) were from rural settings, with most of the rest from small cities (21%) or large cities (18%);
- regional representation was 41% from eastern Tennessee, 32% from the middle part of state, and 25% from western Tennessee;
- three quarters (77%) had over five years of administrative experience, and well over half (55%) of respondents were seasoned administrators with over 10 years of experience;
- nearly half (46%) were certified at Level I of the Career Ladder, only 6% were at Level II, another third (32%) were at Level III, 3% held professional certification, and 11% were not on Career Ladder; and
- over a third (38%) had been evaluated at Level I, only 4% at Level II, another third (35%) had been evaluated at Level III, while 17% indicated this was not applicable to them.

Table A-1 in Appendix C provides more specific information on respondents' characteristics.

II. Perceptions about the Overall Effect of the Administrator Career Ladder on Schooling and School People

Section 4. In Section 4 of the survey, respondents were asked to respond to eight items, each related to a different aspect of Tennessee schooling that might have been affected by the Career Ladder Program (see box). An aggregation of these eight items provides a view of administrators' general sense of career ladder effects (See **Table 1**). Overall, 15 percent of respondents thought the effect had been somewhat or significantly negative, 33 percent thought it had made no difference, and the majority--53 percent--thought the effect had been somewhat or significantly positive. More superintendents responded positively (62 percent)

Table 1—Total for All Contributions of Career Ladder Program Items

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Sign. Neg. 1	Some Neg. 2	No Diff. 3	Some Pos. 4	Sign. Pos. 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1080**	**5**	**10**	**33**	**39**	**14**	**3.48**	**1.01**
By Position								
Principal	598	5	9	33	39	14	3.48	1.00
Asst. Prin	35	7	11	26	43	14	3.46	1.07
Superintendent	45	5	5	28	37	25	3.71	1.05
Instr. Super.	214	5	9	30	39	17	3.55	1.03
Other	174	4	12	37	37	9	3.34	0.97
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	88	5	9	39	34	13	3.40	1.00
Provisional	26	9	21	35	30	6	3.02	1.05
Career Ladder I	504	7	13	40	34	6	3.19	0.98
Career Ladder II	62	2	8	25	49	16	3.69	0.91
Career Ladder III	348	2	5	20	46	27	3.89	0.94
Other	24	3	8	38	44	7	3.45	0.85

Section 4 of the survey asked administrators for their perceptions regarding the effect of the Career Ladder on Tennessee schooling and school people. They were asked to circle one response to the right of each item.

In my view, the Career Ladder has had the following effect on this variable:

5 = significant and positive
4 = somewhat positive
3 = no difference
2 = somewhat negative
1 = significant but negative

4-1	Student achievement	5 4 3 2 1
4-2	Public financial support	5 4 3 2 1
4-3	Professional growth	5 4 3 2 1
4-4	Classroom teaching	5 4 3 2 1
4-5	Building-level leadership	5 4 3 2 1
4-6	Teacher extended contract opportunities	5 4 3 2 1
4-7	Administrator extended contract opportunities	5 4 3 2 1
4-8	Retention of teachers in the profession	5 4 3 2 1

Table 2—Effects Ranked from Most Positive to Least Positive

Effect on:	n	Percent Indicating: Sign. Neg. 1	Some Neg. 2	No Diff. 3	Some Pos. 4	Sign. Pos. 5	Mean	SD
Teacher extended contract opport.	1081	3	7	12	51	27	3.92	0.97
Admin. extended contract opport.	1078	3	6	23	45	22	3.76	0.98
Professional growth	1081	3	8	24	47	18	3.69	0.96
Building-level leadership	1080	4	10	37	36	13	3.43	0.97
Classroom teaching	1081	4	11	34	41	10	3.41	0.96
Public financial support	1080	4	10	40	36	10	3.37	0.94
Student achievement	1080	4	6	47	36	7	3.37	0.85
Retention of teachers	1080	12	19	44	19	6	2.88	1.04

Table 3—Results on item: Implementation of the Career Ladder has resulted in more effective educators in Tennessee

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1187**	**29**	**23**	**20**	**19**	**9**	**2.57**	**1.32**
By Position								
Principal	652	27	24	19	19	10	2.61	1.33
Asst. Prin.	36	19	28	22	25	6	2.69	1.21
Superintendent	52	21	21	17	25	15	2.92	1.40
Instr. Super.	230	27	20	22	20	10	2.68	1.34
Other	191	42	22	19	14	3	2.15	1.20
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	99	41	15	21	15	7	2.31	1.34
Provisional	31	48	26	16	10	0	1.87	1.02
Career Ladder I	543	38	31	18	9	3	2.07	1.09
Career Ladder II	66	18	30	23	23	6	2.68	1.19
Career Ladder III	379	13	12	21	34	20	3.37	1.28
Other	26	27	23	19	27	4	2.58	1.27

than other administrators, as did people at the upper levels of the Career Ladder (65 percent of Level IIs and 73 percent of Level IIIs).

A breakdown by item (**Table 2**) showed that administrators thought the Career Ladder program had a more positive effect on some aspects of schooling than others. For instance, 78 percent gave positive ratings to extended contract opportunities for teachers and 67 percent gave positive ratings to extended contract opportunities for administrators. Professional growth received a highly positive rating (65 percent). Only one item--retention of teachers--received a negative rating. A quarter of respondents thought the Career Ladder program had a positive effect on retention of teachers; everyone else thought the effect had been nil or negative. See Table A2 in the Appendix for more detailed information displayed by position and Career Ladder level.

Other Items. Five other items in the survey asked about the overall effect of the Career Ladder on Tennessee schooling and school people. The scale used for these items was: 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree. The results for each of these five items are discussed and displayed next.

Item 1-4. Implementation of the Career Ladder has resulted in more effective educators in Tennessee. **Table 3** presents the results for this item. The mean response was in the disagree range of the scale, with only one quarter (28 percent) of respondents agreeing with the statement. The only subgroup that had a majority who agreed with this statement was Career Ladder III administrators (54 percent). Superintendents were less in disagreement with this item than other position types. Forty percent indicated agreement compared with 27 percent agreement for combined other position types. Also, there is an increasing trend toward more agreement as Career Ladder status increases. Ten percent of the provisional status respondents agreed, 12 percent of the level I respondents agreed, 29 percent of the level II respondents agreed, and as mentioned before, 54 percent of the level III respondents agreed. Twenty-two percent of the non-Career Ladder respondents agreed.

Table 4—Results on Ladder is helping to improve the schoc is in Tennessee

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1124**	**15**	**20**	**31**	**26**	**8**	**2.92**	**1.18**
By Position								
Principal	615	14	21	30	26	8	2.94	1.17
Asst. Prin.	35	9	17	29	40	6	3.17	1.07
Superintendent	50	10	12	26	36	16	3.36	1.19
Instr. Super.	218	16	16	35	24	9	2.95	1.18
Other	188	20	23	29	24	4	2.69	1.16
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	93	20	27	24	22	8	2.69	1.23
Provisional	30	30	23	23	23	0	2.40	1.16
Career Ladder I	522	21	26	34	15	3	2.53	1.08
Career Ladder II	64	5	23	28	38	6	3.17	1.02
Career Ladder III	355	5	9	29	40	17	3.54	1.04
Other	25	8	12	36	36	8	3.24	1.05
By Work Setting								
Rural	506	16	23	33	22	7	2.81	1.15
Small City	244	19	18	27	27	8	2.88	1.24
Suburban	141	11	18	32	31	9	3.09	1.12
Urban	208	12	17	29	31	11	3.13	1.17
By Region								
East	459	18	18	32	23	9	2.87	1.22
Middle	363	13	25	29	26	7	2.89	1.13
West	282	13	16	32	31	8	3.05	1.14
By Administrative Assignment								
K/Elementary	420	15	21	31	25	8	2.90	1.17
Middle/Jr. High	111	11	19	38	26	6	2.98	1.07
High School	141	11	20	28	31	10	3.09	1.17
Central Office	328	17	20	29	25	8	2.87	1.21
Other	101	16	17	33	29	6	2.92	1.15

Item 3-8. People in my community believe that Career Ladder is helping to improve the schools in Tennessee. Results for this item are presented in **Table 4**. The mean response was slightly in the disagree range of the scale. Superintendents had a higher level of agreement (52 percent) than the combined other position types (33 percent). Upper level Career Ladder respondents were more in agreement than lower level respondents (57 percent for level III and 44 percent for level II).

Three other differences are worth mentioning.

- Urban (42 percent agreed) and suburban (40 percent agreed) respondents tended to be less in disagreement with this statement

Table 5—Results on item: Parents and comunity people prefer upper-level Career Ladder administrators in their schools

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1123**	**14**	**19**	**44**	**16**	**6**	**2.81**	**1.07**
By Position								
Principal	616	14	21	43	15	7	2.81	1.08
Asst. Prin.	35	17	14	29	31	9	3.00	1.24
Superintendent	50	16	6	44	20	14	3.10	1.22
Instr. Super.	216	14	19	46	13	6	2.78	1.06
Other	188	14	19	45	21	1	2.77	0.97
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	93	19	16	46	13	5	2.69	1.09
Provisional	30	30	30	27	13	0	2.23	1.04
Career Ladder I	522	21	27	43	8	2	2.43	0.96
Career Ladder II	64	3	19	42	28	8	3.19	0.94
Career Ladder III	354	4	9	44	29	14	3.38	0.97
Other	25	8	16	52	16	8	3.00	1.00
By Administrative Assignment								
K/Elementary	421	15	22	42	14	7	2.75	1.09
Middle/Jr. High	111	12	15	52	16	5	2.86	0.98
High School	141	12	17	38	21	11	3.03	1.15
Central Office	326	15	18	44	17	5	2.78	1.06
Other	101	9	19	49	20	4	2.91	0.95

than small city (35 percent agreed) and rural (29 percent agreed) respondents.

- Respondents from the western region (39 percent agreed) were in slightly more agreement with the statement than those in the eastern region (31 percent agreed) and the middle region (33 percent agreed).
- Respondents from high school settings (41 percent agreed) tended to agree more than respondents from other settings (33 percent agreed).

Item 3-9. Parents and community people prefer upper-level Career Ladder administrators in their schools. Results, displayed in **Table 5**, show a mean response slightly in the disagree range of the scale. Superintendents (34 percent) tended to agree more than the combined other position types (22 percent). Upper level respondents (36 percent for level II and 43 percent for level III) agreed more than lower level (13 percent for provisional and 10 percent for level I) respondents. Eighteen percent of the non-Career Ladder respondents agreed with this statement. Respondents from high school settings (31 percent) tended to agree more than those in other than high school settings (22 percent).

Table 6—Results on item: Parents and community people prefer upper-level Career Ladder teachers in their schools

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1123**	**13**	**19**	**39**	**22**	**7**	**2.91**	**1.10**
By Position								
Principal	615	13	21	36	21	8	2.89	1.12
Asst. Prin.	35	11	9	31	43	6	3.23	1.09
Superintendent	50	12	8	42	20	18	3.24	1.20
Instr. Super.	218	13	19	40	21	7	2.90	1.10
Other	187	12	18	44	24	2	2.87	0.98
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	92	16	21	40	15	8	2.77	1.13
Provisional	30	23	37	27	13	0	2.30	0.99
Career Ladder I	522	19	26	40	13	2	2.53	1.01
Career Ladder II	64	3	19	30	39	9	3.33	0.99
Career Ladder III	355	4	9	37	36	14	3.47	0.98
Other	25	8	12	52	20	8	3.08	1.00
By Administrative Assignment								
K/Elementary	420	15	22	36	20	7	2.83	1.13
Middle/Jr. High	111	12	15	45	23	5	2.94	1.02
High School	141	10	19	29	29	13	3.16	1.17
Central Office	328	13	17	42	22	6	2.91	1.07
Other	100	8	18	46	24	4	2.98	0.95

Item 3-10. Parents and community people prefer upper-level Career Ladder teachers in their schools. Again, the results fell within the disagree range of the scale (see **Table 6**). Respondents from the upper-levels of the Career Ladder responded differently than other groups--50 percent of Level IIIs and 48 percent of Level IIs believe parents and community people prefer upper-level Career Ladder teachers in their schools. Only 13 percent of provisional and 15 percent of Level I respondents agreed with the statement. Twenty-three percent of the non-Career Ladder respondents agreed with this statement. Many more high school administrators (42 percent) share this belief than administrators from other settings (28 percent).

Item 3-11. Tennessee should return to a system in which pay increases are based on training and experience only, which excludes any incentive (merit) pay. The results for this item, shown in **Table 7**, had the highest level of variability of all the items in the survey. While the overall response was slightly in the disagree range, 49 percent of the respondents selected one of

Table 7—Results or Item: Tennessee should return to a system in which pay increases are based on training and experience only, which excludes any incentive (merit) pay.

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1117**	**24**	**22**	**15**	**15**	**25**	**2.95**	**1.52**
By Position								
Principal	611	24	22	14	16	24	2.93	1.52
Asst. Prin.	35	29	11	17	14	29	3.03	1.62
Superintendent	50	42	12	14	12	20	2.56	1.61
Instr. Super.	217	25	27	16	8	24	2.81	1.52
Other	186	18	20	15	18	28	3.19	1.49
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	92	22	16	15	14	33	3.20	1.57
Provisional	30	23	10	3	23	40	3.47	1.66
Career Ladder I	521	11	18	16	19	36	3.52	1.40
Career Ladder II	62	29	26	21	15	10	2.50	1.32
Career Ladder III	353	44	31	11	7	7	2.03	1.22
Other	25	28	16	12	24	20	2.92	1.55
By Sex								
Female	347	26	26	13	11	24	2.81	1.53
Male	754	23	20	15	16	25	3.00	1.52
By Administrative Assignment								
K/Elementary	419	22	24	14	15	26	2.99	1.51
Middle/Jr. High	109	28	16	17	16	25	2.94	1.56
High School	140	31	21	10	16	21	2.74	1.56
Central Office	326	24	21	16	11	29	3.00	1.55
Other	100	22	28	16	21	13	2.75	1.36

the extreme positions. Twenty-four percent strongly disagreed, 22 percent disagreed, 15 percent neither agreed nor disagreed, 15 percent agreed, and 25 percent strongly agreed. Upper level respondents disagreed with this statement far more than lower level. (Seventy-five percent of Level IIIs and 55 percent of Level IIs disagreed; 29 percent of Level Is, 33 percent of Provisional and 38 percent of non-Career Ladder respondents disagreed.) Female respondents (52 percent) disagreed more than male respondents (43 percent). Again, administrators from high schools responded differently (52 percent disagreed) than did administrators from other settings (45 percent disagreed). Fifty-four percent of the superintendents and 52 percent of instructional supervisors disagreed with this statement compared with 44 percent disagreement from the other groups combined.

III. Administrators' Perceptions Regarding the Implementation of the Career Ladder Program

Administrators' perceptions regarding the implementation of the Career Ladder Program are examined in the next three sections. The first section reports administrators' views on how well the program involves the people for whom it was designed. The second section examines the evaluation component of the program, including perceptions about the evaluation system in general, local involvement in the evaluation process, criteria used for Career Ladder participation, and instrumentation used in the evaluation. The third section relates to the extended contracts options offered to administrators at the upper levels of the Career Ladder.

Table 8—Results on item: The most competent educators have applied for the upper levels of the Career Ladder

		Percent Indicating						
Group	n	Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1187**	**24**	**25**	**22**	**19**	**9**	**2.64**	**1.29**
By Position								
Principal	651	25	23	22	21	9	2.66	1.30
Asst. Prin.	36	14	31	25	22	8	2.81	1.19
Superintendent	53	21	15	19	28	17	3.06	1.41
Instr. Super.	229	23	30	18	17	12	2.65	1.33
Other	192	26	25	29	17	3	2.47	1.14
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	98	37	22	20	13	7	2.32	1.29
Provisional	31	48	32	13	3	3	1.81	1.01
Career Ladder I	546	35	33	22	10	1	2.10	1.03
Career Ladder II	67	7	28	28	30	6	2.99	1.07
Career Ladder III	376	8	12	22	35	23	3.53	1.19
Other	26	23	19	42	15	0	2.50	1.03
By Administrative Assignment								
K/Elementary	437	27	24	23	17	8	2.56	1.28
Middle/Jr. High	115	20	18	26	25	10	2.88	1.29
High School	150	21	22	18	31	9	2.85	1.30
Central Office	339	23	27	23	17	10	2.65	1.28
Other	115	27	25	23	17	8	2.54	1.27

Table 9—Results on item: The best have actually attained Career Ladder II and III status

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1185**	**21**	**28**	**19**	**22**	**10**	**2.72**	**1.29**
By Position								
Principal	650	21	27	19	20	12	2.74	1.32
Asst. Prin.	36	19	25	14	36	6	2.83	1.28
Superintendent	53	15	15	32	21	17	3.09	1.29
Instr. Super.	228	19	32	12	27	9	2.74	1.29
Other	192	22	30	23	21	4	2.54	1.16
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	99	33	23	23	14	6	2.36	1.25
Provisional	30	47	37	10	3	3	1.80	1.00
Career Ladder I	544	30	40	19	10	1	2.13	1.00
Career Ladder II	66	5	30	24	35	6	3.08	1.04
Career Ladder III	377	5	13	16	41	25	3.68	1.14
Other	26	23	12	35	31	0	2.73	1.15

Involvement of Intended Participants

Four items were used to assess people's views about the success of the program in involving administrators it was designed to reward. These items used the same scale described above, i.e. 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Item 1-1. The most competent educators have applied for the upper levels of the Career Ladder. The results are presented in Table 8. The mean response was in the disagree range. Superintendents (45 percent) agreed with this statement more often than others (28 percent) agreed. There was a strong relationship between the Career Ladder level of the respondents and their tendency to agree or disagree with this statement. Only six percent of the provisional respondents agreed, 11 percent of the Level I respondents agreed, 36 percent of the Level II respondents agreed, 58 percent of the level III respondents agreed, and 20 percent of the non-Career Ladder respondents agreed. Relative to work setting, elementary (25 percent) and central office (27 percent) administrators agreed less than middle/junior high (35 percent) and high school (40 percent) administrators.

Item 1-2. The educators I perceive as being among the best have actually attained Career Ladder II and III status. See Table 9 for these results. Once again Tennessee administrators as a whole disagreed. Similar to Item 1-1, there was a strong rela-

Table 10—Results on item: All certified school personnel should be eligible to apply for the Career Ladder

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1120**	**4**	**6**	**10**	**36**	**44**	**4.12**	**1.04**
By Position								
Principal	614	3	7	13	40	37	4.03	1.02
Asst. Prin.	35	3	9	17	40	31	3.89	1.05
Superintendent	50	10	12	4	28	46	3.88	1.38
Instr. Super.	216	4	5	7	33	50	4.20	1.06
Other	187	3	3	4	28	63	4.44	0.93
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	93	8	5	6	26	55	4.15	1.22
Provisional	30	7	7	0	37	50	4.17	1.18
Career Ladder I	521	3	4	11	42	40	4.12	0.97
Career Ladder II	63	0	8	13	29	51	4.22	0.96
Career Ladder III	353	3	7	11	34	45	4.10	1.06
Other	25	8	12	4	20	56	4.04	1.37
By Administrative Assignment								
K/Elementary	418	3	7	14	39	38	4.03	1.01
Middle/Jr. High	110	4	8	10	39	39	4.02	1.08
High School	141	4	5	13	40	38	4.05	1.02
Central Office	327	6	3	5	28	58	4.30	1.09
Other	101	1	10	6	41	43	4.14	0.98

tionship between Career Ladder status and degree of agreement or disagreement with this statement (i.e., the lower the respondents were on the ladder, the more likely they were to disagree with this statement). Sixty-six percent of the level III respondents, 41 percent of the level II respondents, 11 percent of the level I respondents, six percent of the provisional respondents, and 20 percent of the non-Career Ladder respondents agreed with this statement. Superintendents (38 percent) tended to agree with this item more than other position types (28 percent agreed).

Item 3-6. All certified school personnel should be eligible to apply for the Career Ladder. See Table 10. This item had one

Table 11—Results on item: Educators who move to non-Career Ladder positions (e.g. principal to superintendent or teacher to central office position) should be able to maintain their Career Ladder supplements

		Percent Indicating						
Group	n	Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1124**	**5**	**5**	**7**	**29**	**53**	**4.21**	**1.10**
By position								
Principal	614	5	5	7	31	52	4.21	1.08
Asst. Prin.	36	6	3	3	31	58	4.33	1.07
Superintendent	50	4	2	6	38	50	4.28	0.97
Instr. Super.	218	4	6	7	24	58	4.27	1.10
Other	188	6	7	4	31	51	4.13	1.19
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	93	11	4	10	38	38	3.87	1.27
Provisional	29	3	3	3	31	59	4.38	0.98
Career Ladder I	524	4	7	8	33	47	4.12	1.10
Career Ladder II	64	2	5	6	23	64	4.44	0.92
Career Ladder III	354	5	3	4	23	65	4.41	1.04
Other	25	8	4	4	36	48	4.12	1.20

of the highest levels of agreement of all of the items on the survey, with 80 percent of all respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing. The groups with the very highest levels of agreement were instructional supervisors (83 percent) and those categorizing themselves as "other" (91 percent). Respondents across Career Ladder levels were consistently in agreement with this statement. Another comparison of note is that central office administrators (86 percent) and "other" administrators (84 percent) had higher agreement than combined administrators from elementary, middle/junior high, and secondary settings (77 percent).

Item 3-1. Educators who move to non-Career Ladder positions (e.g. principal to superintendent or teacher to central office position) should be able to maintain their Career Ladder supplements. There was, as indicated in **Table 11**, high agreement with this statement. Eighty-two percent of the respondents agreed with this statement, and most of these (53 percent) strongly agreed. Agreement was consistent across positions and Career Ladder status with the exception that non-Career Ladder respondents (76 percent) had lower agreement than Career Ladder respondents (84 percent).

Table 12—Results on item: In most instances, the Career Ladder evaluation process differentiate s among degrees of excellence: Career Level I (good, competent), Career Level II (better), and Career Level III (best).

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1184**	**28**	**25**	**18**	**21**	**8**	**2.54**	**1.30**
By Position								
Principal	648	28	24	18	20	9	2.59	1.33
Asst. Prin.	36	28	33	14	22	3	2.39	1.20
Superintendent	53	21	23	25	21	11	2.79	1.31
Instr. Super.	230	33	27	13	20	7	2.43	1.33
Other	192	27	27	21	21	4	2.48	1.20
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	99	32	24	18	18	7	2.43	1.30
Provisional	31	45	29	16	6	3	1.94	1.09
Career Ladder I	543	38	30	18	11	3	2.09	1.11
Career Ladder II	65	28	23	22	25	3	2.52	1.23
Career Ladder III	378	12	19	16	36	17	3.26	1.28
Other	26	19	27	27	23	4	2.65	1.16

Evaluation of Career Ladder Participants.

This section examines the evaluation component of the program, including perceptions about the effectiveness and timeliness of the evaluation system, local involvement in the evaluation process, criteria used for Career Ladder participation, and instrumentation used in the evaluation.

Effectiveness and timeliness of evaluation. Three items were related to effectiveness and timeliness.

Item 1-3. In most instances, the Career Ladder evaluation process differentiates among degrees of excellence: Career Level I (good, competent), Career Level II (better), and Career Level III (best). See Table 12. Administrators, as a group, disagreed with this statement. In fact, 53 percent disagreed; 29 percent agreed with the statement. There was less disagreement as Career Ladder level increased. Seventy-four percent of the provisional level respondents disagreed, compared with 31 percent of the Level III respondents.

Item 1-6. The Career Ladder evaluation process accurately reflects an educator's performance. See Table 13. Administrators

Table 13—Results on Item: The Career Ladder evaluation process accurately reflects an educator's performance

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1188**	**31**	**34**	**14**	**18**	**4**	**2.30**	**1.18**
By Position								
Principal	652	27	36	14	19	5	2.39	1.20
Asst. Prin.	36	33	33	14	14	6	2.25	1.23
Superintendent	52	27	29	17	23	4	2.48	1.23
Instr. Super.	230	33	30	15	21	2	2.30	1.18
Other	193	41	33	15	10	2	1.98	1.05
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	99	46	26	13	11	3	1.98	1.15
Provisional	31	52	39	6	3	0	1.61	0.76
Career Ladder I	546	42	40	10	7	1	1.85	0.93
Career Ladder II	67	24	36	15	18	7	2.49	1.25
Career Ladder III	377	10	26	20	36	8	3.06	1.15
Other	26	38	23	27	12	0	2.12	1.07

also clearly disagreed with this statement, with 65 percent disagreeing, and only 22 percent agreeing. The breakdown by Career Level status is notable: 91 percent of the provisional respondents disagreed, 82 percent of the Level I administrators disagreed, 60 percent of Level IIs disagreed, 36 percent of Level IIIs disagreed, and 72 percent of non-Career Ladder respondents disagreed.

Item 1-11. The length of the administrator evaluation cycle should be shortened to one semester. See **Table 14**. Administrators tended to agree with this statement. Superintendents tended to agree less (47 percent) than the other groups (59 percent). Upper level Career Ladder respondents tended to agree more (74 percent for Level II and 69 percent for Level III) than provisional respondents (50 percent), Level I respondents (56 percent) and non-Career Ladder respondents (39 percent).

Local involvement in evaluation. There were five items related to local involvement in the evaluation process.

Item 1-5. Career Level II and III evaluations should involve more local input. Results for this item are found in **Table 15**. There was high agreement with this item. Sixty-seven percent agreed, compared with 17 percent who disagreed. Superintendents tended to agree (55 percent) somewhat less than other

Table 14—Results on item: The length of the administrator evaluation cycle should be shortened to one semester

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1176**	**5**	**10**	**25**	**29**	**30**	**3.70**	**1.15**
By Position								
Principal	646	5	10	26	28	30	3.69	1.15
Asst. Prin.	36	0	11	17	31	42	4.03	1.03
Superintendent	51	6	16	31	31	16	3.35	1.11
Instr. Super.	227	7	7	23	28	35	3.77	1.20
Other	193	5	10	23	35	26	3.66	1.13
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	97	9	22	30	25	14	3.13	1.19
Provisional	32	9	9	31	31	19	3.41	1.19
Career Ladder I	539	5	8	31	27	29	3.68	1.11
Career Ladder II	66	6	6	14	32	42	3.98	1.17
Career Ladder III	376	5	10	16	33	36	3.86	1.15
Other	26	0	8	31	42	19	3.73	0.87

Table 15—Results on item: Career Level II and III evaluations should involve more local input

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1178**	**6**	**11**	**17**	**37**	**30**	**3.75**	**1.16**
By Position								
Principal	649	6	11	16	36	31	3.75	1.18
Asst. Prin.	36	6	3	25	39	28	3.81	1.06
Superintendent	52	4	19	21	40	15	3.44	1.09
Instr. Super.	227	7	13	18	37	25	3.61	1.19
Other	189	3	6	16	39	35	3.97	1.03
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	95	6	7	23	39	24	3.67	1.12
Provisional	31	3	0	16	48	32	4.06	0.89
Career Ladder I	542	5	8	16	36	34	3.87	1.12
Career Ladder II	67	7	13	13	33	33	3.70	1.27
Career Ladder III	376	6	16	17	38	23	3.56	1.19
Other	26	0	12	15	35	38	4.00	1.02

Table 16—Results on Item: Administrators at the local level would do a better job than the State in evaluating applicants for the upper levels of the Career Ladder

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1189**	**10**	**16**	**27**	**31**	**16**	**3.26**	**1.21**
By Position								
Principal	652	9	15	27	32	16	3.32	1.18
Asst. Prin.	36	14	17	19	33	17	3.22	1.31
Superintendent	52	19	19	17	35	10	2.96	1.31
Instr. Super.	229	13	21	29	23	15	3.06	1.25
Other	194	8	13	30	31	18	3.39	1.15
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	99	12	14	30	31	12	3.17	1.19
Provisional	31	0	10	29	42	19	3.71	0.90
Career Ladder I	545	6	10	28	35	21	3.55	1.11
Career Ladder II	67	3	18	36	27	16	3.36	1.05
Career Ladder III	378	17	25	25	23	10	2.82	1.24
Other	27	15	7	30	30	19	3.30	1.30
By Sex								
Female	371	13	18	28	27	15	3.14	
Male	794	9	15	27	32	17	3.32	

position types (67 percent). Upper level and non-Career Ladder respondents tended to agree less (66 percent for Level II, 61 percent for Level III, and 63 percent for non-Career Ladder) than lower level respondents (80 percent for provisional and 70 percent for level I).

Item 1-7. Administrators at the local level would do a better job than the State in evaluating applicants for the upper levels of the Career Ladder. As indicated in **Table 16**, the mean response was in the agree range of the scale. Superintendents and instructional supervisors tended to agree less than those in other positions. Lower level respondents agreed more than upper level and non-Career Ladder respondents. Another difference was related to sex of respondent. Males (49 percent) were more in agreement than females (42 percent).

Item 1-8. The State Department of Education should provide closer monitoring of local evaluations. See **Table 17** for results. Tennessee administrators tended to disagree with this statement. Superintendents and assistant principals tended to agree more than those in other positions. Relative to Career Ladder status, there was consistent disagreement across the levels.

Table 17—Results on Item: The State Department of Education should provide closer monitoring of local evaluation

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1189**	**15**	**30**	**28**	**21**	**7**	**2.76**	**1.14**
By Position								
Principal	652	14	33	28	20	5	2.68	1.10
Asst. Prin.	36	6	28	31	25	11	3.08	1.11
Superintendent	52	12	17	31	31	10	3.10	1.16
Instr. Super.	230	20	29	22	20	9	2.70	1.25
Other	194	11	26	31	21	8	2.92	1.11
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	99	20	26	28	19	6	2.65	1.18
Provisional	31	19	19	32	16	13	2.84	1.29
Career Ladder I	345	14	32	30	17	7	2.70	1.11
Career Ladder II	67	12	28	22	31	6	2.91	1.15
Career Ladder III	378	13	31	24	26	6	2.81	1.15
Other	27	7	22	33	30	7	3.07	1.07

Item 3-4. Local school administrators should be responsible for evaluating and recommending their own teachers for Career Levels II and III. See **Table 18**. Respondents tended to agree with this statement. Administrators with higher level positions or status on the Career Ladder agreed with the statement less that those at lower levels. Superintendents (42 percent) and instructional supervisors (41 percent) tended to agree less with this statement than other position types (48 percent). Lower level respondents (53 percent for provisional and 57 percent for level I) and non-Career respondents (52 percent) were more in agreement than upper level resondents (42 percent for level II and 32 for level III).

Item 3-5. Local school administrators should be a part of a State evaluation team for evaluating teachers for Career Levels II and III. See **Table 19**. There was much agreement with this statement--74 percent agreed or strongly agreed. This agreement was consistent across position types and Career Ladder levels.

Table 18—Results on item: Local school administrators should be responsible for evaluating and recommending their own teachers for Career Levels II and III

		Percent Indicating						
Group	n	Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1124**	**12**	**22**	**20**	**31**	**16**	**3.19**	**1.27**
By Position								
Principal	615	11	21	23	27	18	3.20	1.27
Asst. Prin.	35	3	23	26	37	11	3.31	1.05
Superintendent	50	22	20	16	30	12	2.90	1.37
Instr. Super.	218	17	26	16	28	13	2.95	1.31
Other	188	6	19	16	43	16	3.44	1.16
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	92	16	20	12	41	11	3.11	1.30
Provisional	30	7	13	27	40	13	3.40	1.10
Career Ladder I	524	7	18	18	35	22	3.46	1.22
Career Ladder II	64	9	30	19	28	14	3.08	1.24
Career Ladder III	354	17	28	23	22	10	2.80	1.24
Other	25	16	4	32	28	20	3.32	1.31

Table 19—Results on item: Local school administrators should be a part of a State evaluation team for evaluating teachers for Career Levels II and III

		Percent Indicating						
Group	n	Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1118**	**5**	**7**	**14**	**48**	**26**	**3.82**	**1.06**
By Position								
Principal	612	4	8	13	48	26	3.84	1.04
Asst. Prin.	35	6	6	9	57	23	3.86	1.03
Superintendent	50	10	10	6	48	26	3.70	1.25
Instr. Super.	217	7	7	18	43	24	3.70	1.13
Other	186	3	4	12	54	26	3.97	0.91
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	93	10	2	17	49	22	3.71	1.13
Provisional	30	3	7	20	47	23	3.80	1.00
Career Ladder I	519	5	7	14	49	25	3.82	1.04
Career Ladder II	63	3	8	11	52	25	3.89	0.99
Career Ladder III	353	5	7	13	46	29	3.87	1.06
Other	25	0	12	8	52	28	3.96	0.93

Table 20—Results on item: Educators should be able to achieve upper level Career Ladder status through staff development without evaluation

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1183**	**24**	**29**	**14**	**21**	**13**	**2.69**	**1.37**
By Position								
Principal	650	22	32	12	20	13	2.71	1.37
Asst. Prin.	36	28	22	14	22	14	2.72	1.45
Superintendent	52	50	19	12	15	4	2.04	1.27
Instr. Super.	229	25	30	15	18	12	2.62	1.35
Other	192	22	23	17	23	15	2.85	1.38
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	100	35	25	11	21	8	2.42	1.36
Provisional	30	17	20	20	27	17	3.07	1.36
Career Ladder I	543	12	26	14	28	20	3.20	1.34
Career Ladder II	67	25	33	9	24	9	2.58	1.34
Career Ladder III	376	40	36	13	8	4	2.00	1.09
Other	26	27	23	19	19	12	2.63	1.38
By Sex								
Female	368	28	33	11	17	11	2.49	1.34
Male	793	22	28	14	22	14	2.78	1.37

Criteria used for Career Ladder involvement and placement. Seven items dealt with various criteria for Career Ladder involvement and status.

Item 1-9 Educators should be able to achieve upper level Career Ladder status through staff development without evaluation. See **Table 20.** Administrators tended to disagree with this statement. Superintendents disagreed (69 percent) more than those in other positions (54 percent). Upper level and non-Career Ladder respondents tended to disagree more (58 percent for level II, 76 percent for level III, and 60 percent for non-Career Ladder) than lower level respondents (37 percent for provisional and 38 percent for level I), whose mean responses were in the agree range. Another difference of note was that females (61 percent) disagreed more than males (50 percent).

Item 1-10. Educators should be able to achieve upper level Career Ladder Status through staff development with some type of evaluation. See **Table 21.** Administrators tended to agree with this statement. Superintendents tended to agree less (45 percent) than those in other position types (63 percent). Career Ladder level I (70 percent) and level II respondents (70 percent) had a

Table 21—Results on item: Educators should be able to achieve upper Career Ladder status through staff development with some type of evaluation

		Percent Indicating						
Group	n	Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	1177	8	14	15	48	15	3.46	1.15
By Position								
Principal	646	8	15	15	47	15	3.48	1.14
Asst. Prin.	36	6	14	8	56	17	3.64	1.10
Superintendent	52	15	25	15	35	10	2.98	1.28
Instr. Super.	227	9	16	14	43	18	3.43	1.22
Other	192	8	8	15	58	10	3.54	1.06
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	100	13	21	14	38	14	3.19	1.28
Provisional	31	13	16	23	42	6	3.13	1.18
Career Ladder I	538	5	11	14	52	18	3.67	1.04
Career Ladder II	67	3	6	21	45	25	3.84	0.98
Career Ladder III	374	13	19	14	44	10	3.20	1.22
Other	26	4	12	19	54	12	3.58	0.99

Table 22—Results on item: An administrator Career Ladder Evaluation for the upper levels should include how well the administrator evaluates teachers

		Percent Indicating						
Group	n	Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1183**	**5**	**10**	**20**	**47**	**18**	**3.63**	**1.05**
By Position								
Principal	650	4	10	19	50	18	3.67	1.01
Asst. Prin.	36	6	8	11	56	19	3.75	1.05
Superintendent	52	0	4	19	54	23	3.96	0.77
Instr. Super.	229	7	11	21	41	20	3.55	1.14
Other	194	6	11	23	42	18	3.54	1.10
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	100	8	7	24	41	20	3.58	1.13
Provisional	32	9	9	25	38	19	3.47	1.19
Career Ladder I	542	5	11	22	45	17	3.56	1.06
Career Ladder II	67	0	12	18	54	16	3.75	0.88
Career Ladder III	377	5	8	15	50	21	3.75	1.04
Other	26	4	4	27	50	15	3.69	0.93

Table 23—Results on item: Assistant principals should be evaluated on the same competencies as principals

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	1184	9	22	20	36	13	3.23	1.18
By Position								
Principal	650	8	21	20	37	13	3.26	1.17
Asst. Prin.	36	33	33	17	8	8	2.25	1.25
Superintendent	52	2	10	17	48	23	3.81	0.97
Instr. Super.	228	7	28	21	33	11	3.14	1.15
Other	194	9	21	18	39	13	3.25	1.20
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	100	7	23	21	35	14	3.26	1.17
Provisional	32	9	16	19	41	16	3.38	1.21
Career Ladder I	543	10	22	22	36	11	3.16	1.17
Career Ladder II	67	10	19	18	42	10	3.22	1.19
Career Ladder III	376	7	24	19	35	15	3.26	1.19
Other	25	8	16	16	40	20	3.48	1.23

higher level of agreement than other groups (48 percent for provisional, 54 percent for level III, and 52 percent for non-Career Ladder).

Item 1-12. An administrator Career Ladder evaluation for the upper levels should include how well the administrator evaluates teachers. See **Table 22.** Administrators tended to agree with this statement. Superintendents (77 percent) tended to agree more than those in other positions (65 percent). Upper level respondents (70 percent for level II and 71 percent for level III) tended to agree somewhat more than other groups (57 percent for provisional, 62 percent for level I, and 61 percent for non-Career Ladder).

Item 1-13. Assistant principals should be evaluated on the same competencies as principals. There was general agreement with this item, as shown in **Table 23.** The only position group that disagreed was assistant principals (66 percent disagreed). Superintendents had the highest level of agreement (71 percent agreed). There was consistent agreement across Career Ladder levels.

Item 3-7. Years of experience should be a criterion for eligibility to obtain an upper level of the Career Ladder. The mean response was well into the agree range as shown in **Table 24.** There was relatively consistent response across position types and Career Ladder status. There were two differences that should be

Table 24—Results on Item: Years of experience should be a criterion for eligibility to obtain an upper level of the Career Ladder

Group	n	Percent indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1124**	**8**	**11**	**10**	**43**	**29**	**3.75**	**1.20**
By Position								
Principal	616	7	11	10	46	26	3.74	1.17
Asst. Prin.	35	6	14	3	43	34	3.86	1.22
Superintendent	50	12	8	8	32	40	3.80	1.37
Instr. Super.	217	11	11	12	39	28	3.61	1.29
Other	188	4	11	7	44	33	3.90	1.11
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	93	8	11	8	43	31	3.80	1.21
Provisional	30	10	17	13	40	20	3.43	1.28
Career Ladder I	523	7	11	11	46	26	3.73	1.16
Career Ladder II	64	6	17	14	39	23	3.56	1.21
Career Ladder III	354	10	9	6	41	34	3.81	1.27
Other	25	0	8	24	44	24	3.84	0.90
By Sex								
Female	350	9	12	11	42	25	3.62	1.25
Male	758	7	10	9	44	30	3.80	1.17
By Years of Admin. Exp.								
1-5	218	10	15	11	40	23	3.52	1.27
6-10	243	12	13	7	40	29	3.61	1.33
11-15	262	5	10	8	47	30	3.86	1.11
16-20	197	6	9	11	46	28	3.82	1.12
More than 20	169	5	7	9	45	34	3.95	1.08

noted. Males (74 percent) tended to agree somewhat more than females (67 percent). Also, there was a trend toward higher agreement as years of administrative experience increased.

Item 3-2. All administrators who are on the Career Ladder should be required to attend the Administrators' Academy. See Table 25. Administrators tended to agree with this statement. Superintendents (82 percent) and instructional supervisors (75 percent) tended to agree more than those in other positions (65 percent). Upper level respondents (85 percent for level II and 80 percent for level III) tended to agree more than lower level (70 percent for provisional and 58 percent for level I) and non-Career Ladder (69 percent) respondents. Females (73 percent) tended to agree more than males (67 percent).

Table 25—Results on Item: All administrators who are on the Career Ladder should be required to attend the Administrators Academy

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1125**	**10**	**10**	**12**	**30**	**38**	**3.78**	**1.31**
By Position								
Principal	614	11	11	12	26	39	3.71	1.38
Asst. Prin.	36	17	11	6	33	33	3.56	1.48
Superintendent	50	4	2	12	38	44	4.16	1.00
Instr. Super.	218	8	7	9	32	43	3.94	1.25
Other	189	5	10	18	38	30	3.78	1.12
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	93	10	9	13	41	28	3.69	1.24
Provisional	30	3	13	13	23	47	3.97	1.22
Career Ladder I	524	13	13	16	30	28	3.47	1.36
Career Ladder II	63	0	6	8	25	60	4.40	0.89
Career Ladder III	355	6	7	7	28	52	4.12	1.20
Other	25	0	4	8	48	40	4.24	0.78
By Sex								
Female	352	5	10	13	33	40	3.92	1.18
Male	757	11	10	12	29	38	3.71	1.36

Item 3-3. All administrators who are NOT on the Career Ladder should be required to attend the Administrators' Academy. See **Table 26.** Administrators tended to agree with this statement, although not quite as strongly as they agreed with Item 3-2. Superintendents (64 percent) and instructional supervisors (61 percent) agreed more than those in other groups (50 percent). Upper level respondents (75 percent for level II and 64 percent for level III) agreed more than lower level respondents (54 percent for provisional and 43 percent for level I) and non-Career Ladder respondents (38 percent). Females (60 percent) agreed more than males (49 percent).

Instrumentation used for evaluation. In Item 1-14, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with retention of nine data collection instruments used for Career Ladder level II and III evaluation. **Table 27** presents the results for each instrument, with the instruments listed from highest level of support to lowest level of support for their continued use. Tables A3(1-8) in Appendix C present results by position, Career Ladder status, and other variables discussed in the following results.

Table 26—Results on Item: All administrators who are NOT on the Career Ladder should be required to attend the Administrators' Academy

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1123**	**17**	**16**	**15**	**23**	**29**	**3.31**	**1.46**
By Position								
Principal	615	19	16	14	22	30	3.28	1.50
Asst. Prin.	36	22	28	14	22	14	2.78	1.40
Superintendent	50	6	14	16	28	36	3.74	1.26
Instr. Super.	215	14	11	14	28	33	3.55	1.41
Other	189	16	19	19	24	22	3.17	1.40
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	93	28	18	16	16	22	2.85	1.52
Provisional	30	17	17	13	27	27	3.30	1.47
Career Ladder I	522	23	18	15	24	19	2.98	1.46
Career Ladder II	64	2	11	13	28	47	4.08	1.09
Career Ladder III	354	8	12	16	24	40	3.76	1.32
Other	25	8	8	8	36	40	3.92	1.26
By Sex								
Female	350	11	12	18	26	34	3.60	1.34
Male	757	20	17	14	23	26	3.18	1.49

Three instruments received the greatest support for their continued use in the evaluation process: observation, interview, and superordinate questionnaire.

- Most (82 percent) of the respondents agreed that observation should be retained. There was consistency across the position types, although superintendents were in slightly more agreement. Upper Career Ladder level respondents (91 percent for both levels II and III) had higher agreement than other respondents (76 percent).

- Ranked second was the interview. Eighty-two percent of the respondents agreed that this should be retained. Results were relatively consistent across positions and levels of Career Ladder, although upper levels agreed at a slightly higher percentage.

- Ranked third was the superordinate questionnaire. Seventy-eight percent of administrators agreed that this should be retained. Superintendents and upper level respondents had slightly higher levels of agreement.

Table 27—Agreement with Retention of Administrator Career Ladder Data Collection Instruments, Ordered from Highest to Lowest Agreement for Total Respondent Group

Rank	Instrument	Percent Indicating					Mean	SD
		Str. Disag.	Disag.	Neither	Agree	Str. Agree		
1	Observation	5	5	9	45	37	4.05	1.03
2	Interview	4	5	9	50	32	4.02	0.96
3	Superordinate Questionnaire	5	5	11	46	32	3.96	1.05
4	Teacher Questionnaire	7	7	12	52	21	3.73	1.10
5	Writing Test	8	11	13	39	29	3.69	1.23
6	Reading Test	9	10	14	39	28	3.67	1.22
7	Professional Skills Test	11	10	16	41	21	3.53	1.23
8	Student Questionnaire	20	20	17	31	12	2.95	1.34
9	Administrator Portfolio	28	19	11	27	15	2.82	1.46

Four instruments tended to cluster together in the agree range below the first three instruments. These were: teacher questionnaire, writing test, reading test and professional skills test.

- Seventy-three percent of the respondents felt the teacher questionnaire, which was ranked fourth, should be retained. There was relative consistency across position types. Upper level respondents tended to agree more than lower level and non-Career Ladder participants.

- Ranked fifth was the writing test; 68 percent of the respondents agreed it should be retained. Superintendents were in slightly more agreement than other position types and upper level respondents were in more agreement than lower level and non-Career Ladder participants. Female respondents agreed more than male respondents that the writing test should be retained.

- The reading test was ranked sixth, with 67 percent of the respondents in agreement. Superintendents and upper level respondents tended to have higher levels of agreement. Female

respondents agreed more than male respondents.

- The professional skills test was ranked seventh, with 62 percent of the respondents agreeing that it should be retained. As had been the case with the writing test and the reading test, superintendents, upper level Career Ladder, and female respondents tended to have higher levels of agreement.

Two instruments received significantly less support than those described above: the student questionnaire and the administrator portfolio.

- Only 43 percent of the respondents felt the student questionnaire should be retained. Responses to this were relatively consistent across the position and Career Ladder levels.

- The instrument receiving the least support for continued use was the administrator portfolio; 42 percent indicated that it should be retained. Superintendents tended to give more support to this instrument than other position groups. More upper level Career Ladder respondents thought it should be retained; female respondents gave more support than male respondents to continued use of the administrator portfolio.

Extended Contracts

Finally, the TASSA-AEL survey investigated administrators' perceptions about the extended contracts component of the Career Ladder implementation. Six items sought to determine perceptions about the eligibility, utilization, and management of extended contracts.

Item 2-1. Extended contracts are being effectively utilized to achieve instructional goals. See **Table 28**. Administrators were neutral in their response to this item. Superintendents (47 percent) and instructional supervisors (50 percent) tended to agree more than those in other positions (38 percent). Upper level Career Ladder respondents (59 percent for level II and 61 percent for level III) agreed far more strongly than lower level (9 percent for provisional and 28 percent for level I) and non-Career Ladder (33 percent) respondents.

Item 2-4. Career Ladder II or III educators should be the only ones eligible for extended contracts. See **Table 29**. Again, the mean was close to the midpoint in administrators' response to this item, but in this case, there was high variability of responses. Superintendents (50 percent) tended to agree more with this statement than those in other groups. In fact, 40 percent of them strongly agreed with this statement while only 19 percent of the other respondents strongly agreed. Upper level respondents

Table 28—Results on item: Extended contracts are being effectively utilized to achieve instructional goals

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1158**	**17**	**21**	**21**	**30**	**11**	**2.96**	**1.27**
By Position								
Principal	636	17	21	22	31	9	2.93	1.24
Asst. Prin.	36	17	33	19	22	8	2.72	1.23
Superintendent	51	14	24	16	29	18	3.14	1.34
Instr. Super.	223	13	18	19	33	17	3.24	1.30
Other	191	22	24	21	25	8	2.73	1.28
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	97	24	25	19	24	9	2.70	1.32
Provisional	31	32	35	23	6	3	2.13	1.06
Career Ladder I	528	20	26	26	23	5	2.66	1.17
Career Ladder II	66	5	14	23	48	11	3.47	1.01
Career Ladder III	373	10	14	15	41	20	3.47	1.25
Other	25	20	24	24	20	12	2.80	1.32
By Work Setting								
Rural	528	15	21	21	31	12	3.03	1.27
Small City	246	17	22	18	31	12	2.99	1.30
Suburban	146	15	21	18	37	10	3.05	1.25
Urban	212	22	23	25	22	8	2.71	1.25

(59 percent for level II and 64 percent for level III) were in much more agreement than lower level (26 percent for provisional and 24 percent for level I) and non-Career Ladder respondents.

Item 2-5. All 11-month and 12-month extended contract monies should be passed on to administrators. See **Table 30**. Administrators strongly agreed with this statement. Principals (84 percent) had higher agreement and superintendents (57 percent) had lower agreement than other position types. Upper level respondents (92 percent for level II and 93 percent for level III) were in higher agreement than lower (58 percent for provisional and 69 percent for level I) and non-Career Ladder (51 percent) respondents. Another difference was that those working in central office (65 percent) were in lower agreement than those working in other settings (82 percent).

Item 2-6. Attendance at the Administrators' Academy should count toward extended contract time for administrators. See **Table 31**. Administrators strongly agreed with this statement.

Table 29—Results on Item: Career Ladder II or III educators should be the only ones eligible for extended contracts.

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1155**	**23**	**22**	**12**	**22**	**20**	**2.94**	**1.48**
By Position								
Principal	636	25	21	12	24	18	2.87	1.46
Asst. Prin.	36	25	19	6	22	28	3.08	1.61
Superintendent	50	12	26	12	10	40	3.40	1.53
Instr. Super.	221	22	20	14	21	24	3.04	1.50
Other	191	24	26	12	22	17	2.84	1.45
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	95	25	22	13	15	25	2.93	1.55
Provisional	31	39	23	13	13	13	2.39	1.45
Career Ladder I	527	34	29	13	16	8	2.36	1.32
Career Ladder II	66	11	18	12	35	24	3.44	1.33
Career Ladder III	374	11	14	11	30	34	3.63	1.36
Other	24	21	21	8	21	29	3.17	1.58

Superintendents (63 percent) tended to agree less than those in other positions (87 percent). Upper level respondents (94 percent for level II and 92 percent for level III) were more in agreement than lower level (68 percent for provisional and 80 percent for level I) and non-Career Ladder (66 percent) respondents. Central office (76 percent) tended to agree less than those in other school district settings (87 percent).

Item 2-2. Management of extended contracts is as simplified as possible for this type of program. See **Table 32**. The mean response, was at the midpoint of the scale. Superintendents (56 percent) tended to agree more than those in other positions (38 percent). Upper level respondents (56 percent for level II and 57 percent for level III) were more in agreement than lower level (23 percent for provisional and 27 percent for level I) and non-Career Ladder (33 percent) respondents. Another difference was observed relative to work setting. Urban respondents (23 percent) were in less agreement than those in other work settings (43 percent).

Item 2-3. The State Department of Education should provide closer monitoring of extended contracts. See **Table 33**. There was slight disagreement with this statement. There was slightly lower agreement on the part of instructional supervisors (26 percent) than those in other positions (33 percent). Career Ladder I

Table 30—Results on item: All 11-month and 12-month extended contract monies should be passed on to administrators.

Group	n	Percent Indicating					Mean	SD
		Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5		
Total	**1163**	**8**	**5**	**10**	**18**	**58**	**4.12**	**1.28**
By Position								
Principal	637	4	3	10	17	67	4.40	1.03
Asst. Prin.	36	8	0	17	33	42	4.00	1.17
Superintendent	51	24	12	8	20	37	3.35	1.63
Instr. Super.	227	10	5	11	12	62	4.11	1.35
Other	191	17	14	9	26	35	3.49	1.50
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	95	21	15	13	23	28	3.23	1.53
Provisional	31	16	16	10	13	45	3.55	1.59
Career Ladder I	533	9	6	15	24	45	3.90	1.29
Career Ladder II	66	0	2	6	9	83	4.74	0.64
Career Ladder III	375	3	1	3	10	83	4.69	0.84
Other	25	24	12	12	20	32	3.24	1.61
By Administrative Assignment								
K/Elementary	429	5	3	12	18	62	4.27	1.14
Middle/Jr. High	111	4	2	6	23	66	4.45	0.96
High School	148	3	2	8	14	72	4.50	0.97
Central Office	333	15	10	11	17	48	3.72	1.51
Other	116	9	4	8	24	54	4.09	1.29

respondents (40 percent) and non-Career Ladder participants had higher levels of agreement than those at other levels (21 percent). Respondents from suburban settings (19 percent) were less in agreement than those in other settings (34 percent).

IV. Administrators' Perceptions Regarding a Variety of Incentive Programs

The TASSA-AEL survey listed nine types of incentive programs and asked respondents to rank them from 1 (first preference) to 9 (lowest preference). The incentives were listed and described as follows:

- *GRANTS FOR SCHOOL BASED PROJECTS (monies provided to schools for implementing programs or activities at the school level)*
- *GRANTS FOR INDIVIDUAL STAFF PROJECTS (monies provided to individual teachers or administrators for implementing programs, activities, ideas, etc.)*

Table 31—Results on item: Attendance at the Administrators' Academy should count toward contract time for administrators.

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1169**	**7**	**4**	**6**	**23**	**60**	**4.25**	**1.18**
By Position								
Principal	642	5	2	5	21	68	4.45	1.01
Asst. Prin.	36	8	3	3	28	58	4.25	1.20
Superintendent	51	18	14	6	16	47	3.61	1.60
Instr. Super.	227	9	4	5	26	57	4.18	1.24
Other	192	10	7	10	31	42	3.88	1.31
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	96	18	7	8	33	33	3.57	1.46
Provisional	31	13	3	16	26	42	3.81	1.38
Career Ladder I	537	8	4	7	30	50	4.10	1.21
Career Ladder II	66	2	5	0	18	76	4.62	0.84
Career Ladder III	376	2	1	3	11	81	4.68	0.81
Other	25	12	16	4	28	40	3.68	1.46
By Administrative Assignment								
K/Elementary	430	6	3	5	23	64	4.36	1.09
Middle/Jr. High	113	5	2	5	17	71	4.46	1.05
High School	149	4	3	3	19	70	4.50	0.98
Central Office	435	10	6	8	26	50	3.98	1.33
Other	116	8	5	7	25	55	4.15	1.23

- *CAREER LADDER PROGRAMS (monies provided for a combination of recognition and additional responsibilities such as mentoring and extra work)*
- *MERIT PAY (monies for individual recognition when no additional work is required to receive the monies)*
- *EXTENDED CONTRACTS (monies for additional work when selection is not necessarily based on any type of recognition)*
- *ACROSS-THE-BOARD SALARY INCREASES (monies provided for such things as years of experience, degrees, negotiations, etc., when determination of monies is applied consistently across all staff)*
- *SCHOOL-BASED INCENTIVES (monies provided to schools based upon such things as school improvement or school effectiveness when expending of monies is usually determined by the school. These programs may be thought of as merit pay for schools.)*

Table 32—Results on item: Management of extended contracts is as simplified as possible for this type of program.

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1156**	**13**	**19**	**30**	**30**	**8**	**3.03**	**1.16**
By Position								
Principal	636	12	17	33	31	7	3.06	1.11
Asst. Prin.	36	11	28	19	33	8	3.00	1.20
Superintendent	50	10	14	20	42	14	3.36	1.19
Instr. Super.	223	16	20	19	31	13	3.06	1.31
Other	190	14	21	37	23	6	2.87	1.10
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	97	21	21	26	25	8	2.79	1.26
Provisional	31	16	19	42	13	10	2.81	1.17
Career Ladder I	525	13	21	39	23	4	2.83	1.05
Career Ladder II	66	8	20	17	48	8	3.29	1.11
Career Ladder III	375	10	15	19	42	15	3.37	1.19
Other	24	21	4	42	25	8	2.96	1.23
By Work Setting								
Rural	525	10	16	30	34	9	3.16	1.12
Small City	246	10	18	28	33	11	3.16	1.15
Suburban	146	16	16	29	32	8	3.01	1.20
Urban	212	19	28	30	18	5	2.62	1.14

- *SABBATICAL LEAVE (programs where individuals may take a paid leave of absence for educationally related activities such as pursuing college degrees, exchange programs, etc.)*

- *RELEASE TIME (programs where individuals are able to leave during the work day for educationally related activities such as professional meetings, visitation of other classes, etc.)*

Table 34 presents the results for the total respondent group. The incentive program that received the highest ranking was across-the-board salary increases. Seventy-two percent of the respondents ranked this as one of their top three preferences.

Ranked second, but well below across-the-board salary increases, was grants for school based projects. Thirty-eight percent of the respondents ranked this in their top three preferences.

Next were three incentives that ranked very closely together. Third in the ranking was extended contracts with 33

Table 33—Results on Item: The State Department of Education should provide closer monitoring of extended contracts.

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	**1156**	**15**	**25**	**29**	**20**	**11**	**2.89**	**1.22**
By Position								
Principal	636	13	25	33	19	10	2.86	1.16
Asst. Prin.	36	14	28	17	28	14	3.00	1.31
Superintendent	50	8	32	18	20	22	3.16	1.31
Instr. Super.	222	23	26	24	15	11	2.64	1.29
Other	191	10	20	26	29	15	3.19	1.20
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	96	16	26	24	18	17	2.94	1.32
Provisional	30	10	30	33	13	13	2.90	1.18
Career Ladder I	528	12	20	28	26	14	3.09	1.22
Career Ladder II	65	12	25	38	22	3	2.78	1.02
Career Ladder III	375	19	33	28	13	7	2.57	1.15
Other	24	4	21	29	33	13	3.29	1.08
By Work Setting								
Rural	528	15	24	29	21	11	2.88	1.21
Small City	246	13	28	20	24	15	2.98	1.28
Suburban	146	18	28	37	14	5	2.62	1.08
Urban	212	13	22	32	20	13	2.99	1.21

percent of the respondents ranking it as one of their top three preferences. Fourth was grants for individual projects with 29 percent ranking this incentive as one of their top three preferences. School-based incentives was ranked fifth with 31 percent ranking it as one of their top three preferences.

Ranked sixth was merit pay with 35 percent of the respondents ranking it as one of their top three preferences. There was high variability for this incentive. Forty-one percent ranked it as one of their three lowest preferences.

Career ladder programs were ranked seventh with 25 percent of the respondents ranking it as one of their top three preferences. Ranked eighth was release time with 28 percent ranking it as one of their top three preferences. Ranked last in the set of nine incentives was sabbatical leave with 20 percent ranking it as one of their top three preferences.

Analysis of rankings by sex of respondent indicated two differences. Female respondents gave higher rankings than male

Table 34—Preferences for Various Incentive Programs, Total Respondent Group

Rank	Incentive Program	n	Percent Indicating Highest 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 Lowest	Mean	SD
1	Across-the-board salary increases	1039	53	10	9	5	6	4	4	3	6	2.81	2.53
2	Grants for school-based projects	1029	10	14	14	14	14	11	9	7	7	4.49	2.34
3	Extended contracts	1020	4	16	13	12	13	12	12	9	8	4.94	2.35
4	Grants for individual staff projects	1027	4	9	16	15	16	12	12	10	6	4.96	2.17
5	School-based incentives	1022	7	13	11	13	14	10	14	10	9	5.01	2.41
6	Merit pay	1023	15	13	7	5	7	10	7	11	23	5.31	2.99
7	Career Ladder programs	1024	7	9	9	12	12	12	12	13	14	5.44	2.49
8	Release time	1022	6	9	13	11	9	9	10	14	18	5.49	2.61
9	Sabbatical leave	1024	5	8	7	8	11	9	10	17	26	6.17	2.57

respondents to grants for individual staff projects and release time.

Analysis by position yielded two differences. Assistant principals indicated lower preferences for extended contracts than did other position types. Superintendents indicated higher preference for career ladder programs than did other respondents.

By grade level, there was only one difference--related to school-based incentives. Middle/junior high school respondents indicated school based incentives as a lower preference than other groups while both high school and central office respondents indicated them as higher preferences than other groups.

Urban respondents tended to rank extended contracts somewhat lower and school based incentives somewhat higher than did respondents from other settings.

Two regional differences appeared in the analysis. Respondents from the eastern region of the state ranked extended contracts lower than other respondents. Respondents from the middle region of the State ranked school-based incentives lower than other respondents.

Several differences occurred by Career Ladder status. Non-Career Ladder and level III respondents tended to rank extended contracts higher than the other groups. Provisional and level I respondents tended to rank career ladder programs somewhat lower than other respondents. Career Ladder level III respondents

tended to rank extended contracts, merit pay, and career ladder programs higher; and grants for school-based projects, grants for individual projects, and school-based incentives somewhat lower than other respondents.

V. Summary of Results

Respondents felt the Career Ladder Program had resulted in positive effects, particularly in the areas of: provision of teacher and administrator extended contract opportunities, and professional growth. Positive effects were indicated, at a somewhat lower level, on: building-level leadership, classroom teaching, public financial support, and student achievement. In general, respondents did not feel the Career Ladder Program had any positive effect on the retention of teachers in the profession. Superintendents and upper level Career Ladder respondents tended to attribute higher positive effects than other respondents.

Respondents did not necessarily feel the Career Ladder had resulted in more effective educators in Tennessee or that people in their communities believe that the Career Ladder was helping improve the schools in Tennessee, although superintendents and upper level Career Ladder respondents had more positive perceptions that these things were true. Respondents, except for superintendents and upper level Career Ladder respondents, did not feel that parents or the community necessarily preferred to have upper level Career Ladder administrators or teachers in their schools.

There was almost totally divided opinion on whether Tennessee should return to a system in which pay increases were based on training and experience only, excluding any incentive or merit pay. Those who tended to look upon such a return especially unfavorably were superintendents, upper level Career Ladder respondents, and female respondents.

Except for superintendents and upper level Career Ladder respondents, respondents did not believe that the educators they viewed as being the most competent had applied for or attained upper level Career Ladder status.

Respondents strongly agreed that all certified school personnel should be eligible to apply for the Career Ladder. Instructional supervisors and administrators other than principals, assistant principals, and superintendents were most in favor of this idea. In addition, there was strong support for the idea that educators who move to non-Career Ladder positions be allowed to maintain their Career Ladder supplements.

Respondents were not favorably impressed with the effectiveness of the Career Ladder evaluation process. Most respondents, except Career Ladder III respondents, felt the Career Ladder evaluation process did not differentiate among degrees of excellence and that the evaluation process did not accurately reflect an educator's performance. There was general agreement that the length of the administrator evaluation cycle should be shortened to one semester.

Of the instruments used in the administrator Career Ladder evaluation, there was the greatest support for continued use of the observation, interview, and superordinate questionnaire. Other instruments that respondents thought ought to be retained were the teacher questionnaire, the writing test, the reading test, and the professional skills test. Instruments that did not receive as much support for continued use were the student questionnaire and the administrator portfolio (the least preferred instrument).

Respondents tended to agree that Career Ladder II and III evaluations should involve more local input and that administrators at the local level would do a better job than the State in evaluating applicants for the upper levels of the Career Ladder. Respondents did not support the idea that the State Department of Education should provide closer monitoring of local evaluations.

Local school administrators should be responsible for evaluating and recommending their own teachers for Career Ladder levels II and III, according to respondents, who also believe that local school administrators should be a part of a State evaluation team for evaluating teachers for Career Ladder levels II and III.

Respondents agreed with the idea that educators should be able to achieve upper Career Ladder status through staff development with some type of evaluation. They do not think educators should be able to achieve that status with staff development alone, minus the evalution. There was agreement with the idea that an administrator's Career Ladder evaluation should include how well the administrator evaluates teachers.

All groups, except assistant principals, tended to agree that assistant principals should be evaluated on the same competencies as principals. There was high agreement that years of experience should be a criterion for eligibility to obtain upper level Career Ladder status.

There was agreement that all administrators not on the Career Ladder should be required to attend the administrators' academy. There was even higher agreement that administrators on

the Career Ladder should be required to attend the Administrators' Academy.

Except for superintendents, instructional supervisors, and upper level respondents, respondents did not perceive that extended contracts were being used effectively to achieve instructional goals. Superintendents and upper level Career Ladder respondents were the only groups to agree strongly with the idea that only Career Ladder level II and III educators should be eligible for extended contracts. Respondents strongly agreed that all 11-month and 12-month extended contract monies should be passed on to administrators and that attendance at the Administrators' Academy should count toward contract time.

Superintendents and upper level Career Ladder respondents agreed while urban respondents generally disagreed with an assertion that management of extended contracts was as simplified as possible. Respondents tended to disagree that the State Department of Education should provide closer monitoring of extended contracts.

Clearly the most preferred type of incentive program was across-the-board salary increases. The three next in line were: grants for school-based projects, extended contracts, grants for individual staff projects, and school-based incentives. There was less support for merit pay, career ladder programs, and release time. The least preferred incentive was sabbatical leave. Career ladder programs had higher preference among superintendents and upper level respondents than other groups.

Conclusions

Background

The Career Ladder concept was introduced to Tennessee as part of a massive reform act passed by the Legislature in March 1984. Known as CERA, the Comprehensive Education Reform Act was proposed by Lamar Alexander, who served as Governor of Tennessee from January 1979 through January 1987. CERA was implemented by the Tennessee Department of Education in 1984. Specifically, the Career Ladder portion of CERA was implemented in phases. The Teachers' Career Ladder was developed and field tested in the spring of 1984; the first administrators entered the system in the spring of 1985.

The TASSA-AEL survey was conceptualized just two years later, in April 1987. It was mailed and conducted in November of that same year. During the period of time in which the survey was conducted, emotions and personal reactions to Career Ladder were at a high point. A new governor was elected during this same time period; many administrators could see that more change was in the air.

From any perspective, Career Ladder is still a recent innovation in Tennessee's educational system. Most innovation or change brings with it resistance and negative reactions. This is especially true for a program like the Career Ladder, which has such important personal consequences (e.g., salary supplements, evaluations, and peer review). Throughout its short lifetime, Tennessee's Career Ladder has had its share of outspoken opponents and proponents. From the first mention of the idea, educators have been split over the advisability of such an undertaking.

At the time of the TASSA survey, Career Ladder was still so new to administrators and had the potential for such dramatic personal consequences, it is not surprising that responses to the survey were not positive. Administrators were asked for their honest, personal opinions. Most had not had time to reflect upon the value of such a program to the education of children in Tennessee.

A House Divided

Responses to most of the survey questions varied consistently by position and by Career Ladder status. Overall, superintendents in Tennessee had more positive views about the Administrator Career Ladder than did other administra-

tors. As a group, superintendents are not eligible for the Career Ladder. The generally positive views of the superintendents appear to be a function of their management view of education. Perhaps because they are not personally involved as members of the system, their perspectives are broader. Evidently superintendents, as a group, see more positive than negative potential to be derived for education from the system of Career Ladder and merit pay.

Another group whose responses were consistently more positive than the group as a whole toward the Administrator Career Ladder are those administrators who have participated in the state-administered evaluation process and have achieved upper career level status (levels II and III). As might be expected, those who have chosen not to participate have more negative views. Because, throughout Tennessee, there are more administrators who have chosen not to participate than there are those who have chosen to participate in the upper levels of the Career Ladder, the average administrator response to survey questions is weighted toward the negative.

It is important to keep in mind that those who have chosen to enter the system and have completed the complex evaluation process have not only been successful in attaining the upper levels of the Career Ladder, but they also feel more positively about the system. One group has an "outsiders" perspective; the other views the system from having participated in it. This same kind of difference in opinion between (more positive) participating and (more negative) nonparticipating teachers was reported in a study done for the Arizona Career Ladder Research and Evaluation Project. In that report, as in this, "the slightly negative trends in the results can be attributed largely to nonparticipants." (p. 6)

Some specific results. There is strong feeling--both positive and negative--about whether or not the state should remain on the Career Ladder system. Forty-six percent of the respondents felt Tennessee should not return to a system based on training and experience only; 40 percent thought Tennessee should return to a system that excludes incentive or merit pay. Superintendents and administrators on the upper levels of the Career Ladder, quite predictably, were the groups who were the strongest opponents of Tennessee's returning to a system based solely on years of experience and years of training.

However, in another survey item, administrators showed a clear preference for across-the-board salary increases. The study group concluded that this is a sign that adminis-

trators believe there need to be adjustments made in the salary schedules such that all salaries would be improved. Administrators who responded to this item in the survey demonstrated very little interest in other kinds of incentive programs.

In general, the data suggest that school administrators do not perceive that the Career Ladder program has improved Tennessee schools, which was the original intent of the Career Ladder program.

This perception is in some conflict with opinions reflected in responses to another set of questions. A majority of administrators believe that the Career Ladder has had a positive effect on specific aspects of education in Tennessee, such as providing opportunities for extended contracts, professional growth, leadership, classroom teaching, public financial support, and student achievement. Again, as a group, superintendents and upper level administrators believe most strongly that the Career Ladder is helping to improve schools. Central office staff in particular (i.e., superintendents and instructional supervisors) believe extended contracts are effectively utilized to achieve instructional goals.

A House United

Administrators believe that all certified school personnel should be eligible to apply for the Career Ladder. They strongly agreed (82%) that educators who move to non-Career Ladder positions should be able to maintain their Career Ladder supplements.

Most administrators are neutral or disagree with the notion that the Career Ladder evaluation process accurately reflects performance or that it differentiates among degrees of excellence. They do not believe that the most competent administrators have necessarily applied for or attained the upper levels of the Career Ladder.

However much they think the evaluation process is lacking, though, administrators believe that evaluation should be a part of achieving upper levels of the Career Ladder. Administrators also believe that years of experience should be a part of the eligibility criteria to upper levels of the Career Ladder. That the evaluation process can be improved seems to be without question. Some of the improvements administrators seemed to support are listed below.

- Evaluations for Career Levels II and III should involve more local input.

- Shorten the evaluation system to one semester.

- Include how well administrators evaluate teachers as a part of the overall process of evaluating administrators. (NOTE: This change has been implemented by the Board of Education since this study was completed in January 1988.)

- Retain existing evaluation instruments with the possible exceptions of the student questionnaire and the administrator portfolio..

The results of the survey point to support for the Administrators' Academy. Administrators (68%) agreed that attendance should be required--especially for those on the Career Ladder. Slightly over half believed even those NOT on the Career Ladder should be required to attend. (NOTE: Attendance at the Academy has always been mandatory.)

Most survey questions pertained to the Administrator Career Ladder, but one item focused on the role of administrators in the Teacher Career Ladder. According to 74 percent of respondents, local school administrators should be a part of the state evaluation team for evaluating teachers for Career Levels II and III. (NOTE: Since the survey has been completed, this change has been made. Teachers can request that the local school administrator be a part of the state evaluation team.)

Regarding local options for administration of the extended contracts and salary supplements, administrators tended to agree that there should be statewide consistency. Administrators believe the attendance at the Academy should count toward extended contract time. (NOTE: This has always been an option for local education agencies.) They also believe that all money should be passed on to local school administrators.

Recommendations

Based on the results of the survey, the TASSA-AEL study group formed the following recommendations. Some of these, as noted in the text above, have already been acted upon by the State Board of Education. Others have already received some consideration, and the study group members hope that these recommendations will help to formulate positive changes to the Career Ladder system in the state of Tennessee.

1. The Administrator Career Ladder program should be continued and improved.

2. Upper levels of the Career Ladder should continue to be earned through an evaluation process. The evaluation system should be changed to include the following:

   A. Shorten the evaluation cycle from one year to one semester.
   B. Add a new component to measure the administrator's effectiveness in evaluating teachers.
   C. Increase the amount of local input for upper level evaluations for administrators.

3. Retain most of the instruments in the current evaluation system. However, because there were mixed opinions about the retention of the portfolio and the student questionnaire, evaluate the continued use of the portfolio and the student questionnaire as data sources in the Career Ladder evaluation system.

4. Career Ladder programs should be developed and established for all certified school personnel.

5. The state should continue its support of Administrators' Academies. Attendance at the academies should count as extended contract time.

6. Give attention to across-the-board salary increases and provide uniformity in the administration of Career Ladder extended contract monies.

7. Continue to conduct research for the improvement of the Career Ladder program.

The data suggest that further study be done on the Career Ladder program to determine why administrators per-

ceive that the process does not discriminate by quality of performance.

Another research task should address the problems of how to achieve the desired increased levels of local input and award upper Career Levels to both teachers and administrators, while still maintaining reliability in the system.

Appendix A

TASSA-AEL STUDY GROUP

To: TASSA study group members

From: Sandra Orletsky and Beth Sattes
School Governance and Administration

Date: July 21, 1987

Subject: Results of the first study group meeting, June 14, 1987, Nashville

Enclosed is a summary of the results of our first study group meeting in Nashville, where we generated possible questions for a statewide survey of administrators about the Tennessee Career Ladder for Administrators. In this enclosure, you will find the key question posed to the study group members, the 43 questions generated by the study group in response to the key question, and the votes given to each question.

You may remember that when we voted on the questions, each member got five votes. Their number one choice was given a weight of "5"; their second choice received a weight of "4"; their fifth choice received a vote of "1". In the first enclosure, in the column headed "Votes", the numbers represent weighted votes given by study group members. On the second enclosure, where questions are listed in categories, the "Votes" column represents the total of weighted votes received by each question.

In the second enclosure, you will find categories into which the 43 questions were clustered. This was the work of three of us the day after the meeting--to try to collapse the 43 questions into a few discrete categories. As you can see, we came up with 8 clusters or categories. The biggest vote-getter was a question about extended contract payments. The category with the most votes has to do with the relationship of career ladder to competency. These high-vote categories will form the basis of the questions for the statewide survey of Tennessee administrators.

The last enclosure is an article about the Nominal Group Technique, the process we used for that meeting. We find it to be a good technique for helping groups brainstorm and prioritize. You may want to adapt it and use it in your work.

Milton West, the study group chair, presented some of the group's work during the TASSA conference and gathered more opinions. We will be sending you the results of those presentations shortly. Milton has also appointed a subcommittee to work on the actual survey questions. They hope to meet in the first week of August. We will send you the results of that meeting as soon as possible. Please call us (800-624-9120) or Milton if you have any more input to the development of the survey questions.

P.S. We've also included a participant list -- names and addresses

Appalachia Educational Laboratory • Post Office Box 1348 • Charleston • West Virginia
Telephone: 304/347-0400 • toll free in WV 800/344-6646 • toll free outside WV 800/624-9120

Nominal Group Technique

The following guidelines for the Nominal Group Technique (NGT) have been adapted from Group Techniques for Program Planning by Andre L. Delbecq, Andrew H. Van de Ven, and David H. Gustafson, pp. 40-66. Scott, Foresman and Company, 1975.

Step 1: Silent Generation of Ideas in Writing

Leader presents the nominal question in written form, reads the question aloud, and asks the group to write their ideas in brief phrases. The leader should avoid clarifying the question or giving examples. Members work independently. The leader should model good group behavior by writing ideas silently.

During this step, every group member has adequate time to think and reflect, without influence from other group members. The silent generation avoids competition, keeps the group problem-centered, and prevents premature choosing of ideas or solutions.

Step 2: Round-Robin Recording of Ideas

Record the ideas of the group on a flip chart. Go around the table, asking for one idea from each member in turn. In recording ideas, use the words of the group members--don't editorialize. Encourage people to "hitchhike" (that is, if another person's idea stimulates one you haven't thought of, feel free to add it at your turn). If one of your ideas has already been recorded, you don't need to give it again. Members can pass at any time.

The leader should accept all ideas and record as rapidly as possible. If necessary, the leader may help to abbreviate a sentence so that it is a brief phrase. Make sure everyone in the group can see all the written ideas; tear off sheets of paper and tape them to the wall in a visible location. The leader should not permit discussion of ideas during this step.

This step provides a written record of the group's ideas. Written ideas are more objective and less attached to an individual; all group members have a more equal chance to participate. The group's creativity will increase with this equalization technique; the group will not be dominated by an aggressive personality or a high-status member.

-over-

Step 3: Serial Discussion for Clarification

Discuss each idea, in turn, for clarification. This is an opportunity to present the logic of each idea, to eliminate misunderstanding, and to argue for the merits of particular ideas. The main purpose is to clarify, not to win arguments.

The leader's role is to pace the discussion so as to prevent undue focus on any one item and to assure that all points of view are heard on all the ideas. Explain the step to the group and then keep the discussion moving quickly.

Step 4: Preliminary Vote on Item Importance

At this point, the group needs to begin to select the most important ideas--to make the list manageable. In NGT, members make independent judgements. These are expressed in rank order, averaged for a group decision, and fed back to the group for another vote.

Ask each member to select the five most important items, write each of those five on a separate 3 x 5 card, and record the number of the item in the top left corner.

Use a step-by-step process to prioritize the items.

1. Spread all five cards face up in front of you.
2. Select the <u>most</u> important, and write the number 5 in the lower right corner. (Underline it three times to distinguish this ranking from the item number itself.)
3. From the four remaining cards, select the <u>least</u> important, and write the number 1 in the lower right corner. Underline it three times.
4. Now choose the <u>most</u> important of the three remaining (rank=4), the <u>least</u> important of the two (rank=2), and the last card (rank=3).

List, for each item number, the rank votes from all the 3 x 5 cards to get a group total.

Step 5: Discussion of the Preliminary Vote

Members of the group can discuss items they perceive as having received too many or too few votes. They can also examine inconsistencies in the voting pattern. The leader should clarify for the group that the purpose is not to pressure people to change their original votes, but rather to clarify and discuss.

Step 6: Final Vote

This step combines individual judgements into a group decision. Use the same process as Step 4.

TASSA Study Group Meeting
June 14, 1987

Key Question: What questions would you like to ask Tennessee administrators about the Career Ladder?

The study group members generated 43 questions.

		Votes	Total
1.	Extended contract "duplicated" payments--some principals receive extended contract and merit; others receive only merit. Should all 11- and 12-month contract money be passed on? Should state require that? Or local board choice?	5, 2, 5, 2, 5, 5	24
2.	What can be done to address the quality of observations?	4, 3	7
3.	Why do principals have portfolio? (Teachers have eliminated portfolio.)	3, 4, 4, 4	16
4.	In lieu of evaluation of administrators and supervisors, do you think state should pay administrators for increased paperwork and forget evaluations (cost vs. time)? Should whole system be changed?	3	3
5.	Why should the limit of 80%-20% be placed on supervisors (for work in field, in-school supervision)?		
6.	Is feedback to administrators inadequate after each observation?		
7.	Is length of time too long? Teachers have a semester; administrators have one year.		
8.	Do you think the upper levels of Career Ladder are too easy or too hard to attain?	5, 1, 4	10
9.	Have the most competent administrators applied for Career Ladder evaluation?	2, 5	7
10.	Has the Career Ladder identified the most competent administrators?	3	3

		Votes	Total
11.	Can it identify most competent? Does it identify those it should and exclude those it should? Differentiate?	3, 2	5
12.	Why is portfolio limited to 200 pages? (agree or disagree)		
13.	Why can't local evaluation (two every five years) stand in lieu of state level evaluations?		
14.	Has adoption of TIMS actually improved instruction?	1	1
15.	BSF tests do not include measurements for language arts below 9th grade. Do you think they should be expanded?		
16.	What is inter-test reliability between national (e.g., Stanford) and BSF?		
17.	Is this evaluation process fair to assistant principals whose principal does not allow them to perform certain activities in certain competencies?		
18.	Did you have to role play to become Career Ladder II or III administrator?	1, 2	3
19.	Why are Career Ladder opportunities not available to all administrators serving in an instructional role requiring certification by state?	2	2
20.	Have evaluators acted professionally? Been trained well enough? Competent?		
21.	Do you think teachers are discouraged from accepting administrative jobs because of losing Career Ladder status?	2	2
22.	Do you think they should be? Vice versa: should administrators be able to move to teaching and retain Career Ladder status?		
23.	Does Career Ladder status of administrators affect the attitudes toward Career Ladder of teachers who report to that administrator?	4	4
24.	To what extent do you think objectives of CERA have been met?	5, 3	8

		Votes	Total
40.	Has merit pay produced a higher level of professionalism?	4	4
41.	To what extent has Career Ladder teacher evaluation taken away from or contributed to administrative leadership?		
42.	To what extent has duty-free lunch put a burden on you as principal?	1, 3	4
43.	Do you feel parts of CERA (other than Career Ladder) have received adequate attention?		

		Votes	Total
25.	Do you think the Career Ladder program should be abolished?	2	2
26.	Should all administrators be required to go to Principal Academy?		
27.	Why should administrators work 7.5 hours, when teachers work 7.0? Should teachers and administrators work equal time daily?	3	3
28.	Has your participation in Career Ladder improved your performance?	4, 5, 1, 4, 5, 1	20
29.	Do you recommend changing the Career Ladder evaluation system?	2, 3	5
30.	Is compensation adequate for: a. Career Ladder I? b. Career Ladder II? c. Career Ladder III?	4	4
31.	Should upper Career Ladder be state- or locally-administered (or somewhere in between)?		
32.	Would you be willing to be trained by the state in order to do local evaluations of Career Ladder II or III?	1, 2	3
33.	To what extent has new governance structure (state) been effective? How much better or worse is it?	1	1
34.	Has local control diminished or increased?		
35.	In your opinion, what is the most positive aspect of CERA?	1	1
36.	Should merit pay and extended contract be separated?	4	4
37.	Should all principals be offered extended contract?	1	1
38.	Are extended contract activities beneficial for improving instruction?		
39.	Should there be minimum levels of experience for Career Ladder participation?	3	3

Category: Competency (continued)

		Votes
40.	Has merit pay produced a higher level of professionalism?	4
10.	Has the Career Ladder identified the most competent administrators?	3
18.	Did you have to role play to become Career Ladder II or III administrator?	3
39.	Should there be minimum levels of experience for Career Ladder participation?	3
38.	Are extended contract activities beneficial for improving instruction?	—
	Total	55

Category: Portfolio

3.	Why do principals have portfolio? (Teachers have eliminated portfolio.)	16
12.	Why is portfolio limited to 200 pages? (agree or disagree)	—
	Total	16

Category: CERA

24.	To what extent do you think objectives of CERA have been met?.	8
33.	To what extent has new governance structure (state) been effective? How much better or worse is it?	1
35.	In your opinion, what is the most positive aspect of CERA?	1
43.	Do you feel parts of CERA (other than Career Ladder) have received adequate attention?	—
	Total	10

Milton West, Sandy Orletsky, and Beth Sattes met on the following day to analyze the questions. The items fell into the following clusters or categories:

Extended contract
Competency
Portfolio
CERA
Career Ladder evaluation: Is it worth it?
Observation/quality
Unpredicted effects of Career Ladder
Other administrators

In the following lists, you will find the original items and weighted voting results by category.

Category: Extended Contract

		Votes
1.	Extended contract "duplicated" payments--some principals receive extended contract and merit; others receive only merit. Should all 11- and 12-month contract money be passed on? Should state require that? Or local board choice?	24
30.	Is compensation adequate for: a. Career Ladder I? b. Career Ladder II? c. Career Ladder III?	4
36.	Should merit pay and extended contract be separated?	4
37.	Should all principals be offered extended contract?	1
	Total	33

Category: Competency

28.	Has your participation in Career Ladder improved your performance?	20
8.	Do you think the upper levels of Career Ladder are too easy or too hard to attain?	10
9.	Have the most competent administrators applied for Career Ladder evaluation?	7
11.	Can it identify most competent? Does it identify those it should and exclude those it should? Differentiate?	5

Category: Unpredicted Effects of Career Ladder (continued)

		Votes
4.	In lieu of evaluation of administrators and supervisors, do you think state should pay administrators for increased paperwork and forget evaluations (cost vs. time)? Should whole system be changed?	3
39.	Should there be minimum levels of experience for Career Ladder participation?	3
21.	Do you think teachers are discouraged from accepting administrative jobs because of losing Career Ladder status?	2
22.	Do you think they should be? Vice versa: should administrators be able to move to teaching and retain Career Ladder status?	
41.	To what extent has Career Ladder teacher evaluation taken away from or contributed to administrative leadership?	—
	Total	12

Category: Other Administrators

19.	Why are Career Ladder opportunities not available to all administrators serving in an instructional role requiring certification by state?	2
5.	Why should the limit of 80%-20% be placed on supervisors (for work in field, in-school supervision)?	
17.	Is this evaluation process fair to assistant principals whose principal does not allow them to perform certain activities in certain competencies?	—
	Total	2

Category: Career Ladder Evaluation: Is It Worth It?

		Votes
29.	Do you recommend changing the career Ladder evaluation system?	5
4.	In lieu of evaluation of administrators and supervisors, do you think state should pay administrators for increased paperwork and forget evaluations (cost vs. time)? Should whole system be changed?	3
18.	Did you have to role play to become Career Ladder II or III administrator?	3
32.	Would you be willing to be trained by the state in order to do local evaluations of Career Ladder II or III?	3
25.	Do you think the Career Ladder program should be abolished?	2
20.	Have evaluators acted professionally? Been trained well enough? Competent?	
31.	Should upper Career Ladder be state- or locally-administered (or somewhere in between)?	
	Total	16

Category: Observation/Quality

2.	What can be done to address the quality of observation?	7
6.	Is feedback to administrators inadequate after each observation?	
20.	Have evaluators acted professionally? Been trained well enough? Competent?	
	Total	7

Category: Unpredicted Effects of Career Ladder

23.	Does Career Ladder status of administrators affect the attitudes toward Career Ladder of teachers who report to that administrator?	4

Appendix B

TASSA-AEL STUDY GROUP
Tennessee Career Ladder Survey

November 16, 1987

Dear Tennessee Administrator:

The Tennessee Association for School Supervision and Administration (TASSA) and the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) have collaborated to develop the enclosed survey on the Tennessee Career Ladder. This project is designed to obtain information on administrators' perceptions of the Career Ladder Program in Tennessee. Every administrator in the state will be surveyed. The results will be compiled and used by TASSA during the upcoming legislative session.

The survey includes sections on the Career Ladder evaluation system, extended contracts, related policies and issues, contributions of the Career Ladder, and incentive programs. We would appreciate your taking the time to fill out the enclosed survey form as completely as possible. Based on the pilot test findings, it should take about 20 minutes.

It is important that you respond by November 30, 1987, so that the results can be compiled before the legislative session. Please send your completed survey to Jo Gateley in the stamped, self-addressed envelope enclosed. If you have any questions, feel free to call Jo at 901/357-3565.

This is your chance to express your opinions about the Career Ladder! Please help us make an impact by completing your survey today. Survey results will be made available through TASSA.

Sincerely,

Jo Gateley

Jo Gateley, President
TASSA

Milton West

Milton West, Chairman
TASSA-AEL Study Group

Enclosures

TASSA-AEL Study Group
Tennessee Career Ladder Survey

This survey is designed to obtain information on administrators' perceptions of the Tennessee Career Ladder Program for both teachers and administrators. At the beginning of each section is an overview, which places the pertinent questions in context. Please respond to all questions in light of this context and according to the scale(s) described for the section.

Section 1: CAREER LADDER EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS

This section addresses the Career Ladder evaluation system for principals, assistant principals, supervisors of instruction, and teachers. Consider both local evaluation for Career Level I and state evaluation for Career Levels II and III unless indicated otherwise in the statement.

Please respond to all statements using the following scale. Where there are two response scales, please respond to both. Circle your response to the right of each statement:

5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

		Respond for both groups.	
		Administrators	Teachers
1-1	The most competent educators have applied for the upper levels of the Career Ladder.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
1-2	The educators I perceive as being among the best have actually attained Career Ladder II and III status.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
1-3	In most instances, the Career Ladder evaluation process differentiates among degrees of excellence: Career Level I (good, competent), Career Level II (better), and Career Level III (best).	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
1-4	Implementation of the Career Ladder has resulted in more effective educators in Tennessee.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
1-5	Career Level II and III evaluations should involve more local input.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
1-6	The Career Ladder evaluation process accurately reflects an educator's performance.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
1-7	Administrators at the local level would do a better job than the State in evaluating applicants for the upper levels of the Career Ladder.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
1-8	The State Department of Education should provide closer monitoring of local evaluations.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1

5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

		Administrators	Teachers
1-9	Educators should be able to achieve upper level Career Ladder status through staff development without evaluation.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
1-10	Educators should be able to achieve upper level Career Ladder status through staff development with some type of evaluation.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
1-11	The length of the administrator evaluation cycle should be shortened to one semester.	5 4 3 2 1	
1-12	An administrator Career Ladder evaluation for the upper levels should include how well the administrator evaluates teachers.	5 4 3 2 1	
1-13	Assistant principals should be evaluated on the same competencies as principals.	5 4 3 2 1	
1-14	The following instruments should be retained for Career Level II and III administrator evaluations:		
	a. Administrator's portfolio	5 4 3 2 1	
	b. Student questionnaire	5 4 3 2 1	
	c. Teacher questionnaire	5 4 3 2 1	
	d. Professional Skills Test	5 4 3 2 1	
	e. Interview	5 4 3 2 1	
	f. Reading test	5 4 3 2 1	
	g. Writing test	5 4 3 2 1	
	h. Superordinate questionnaire	5 4 3 2 1	
	i. Observation	5 4 3 2 1	

1-15 In your opinion, what other instruments should be added for Career Level II and III administrator evaluations?

Section 2: EXTENDED CONTRACTS

This section addresses the extended contracts component of the Career Ladder program. Presently, all administrators who attain Levels II or III are required to work the 11th month. In addition, those who attain Level III have the option of working a 12th month. Teachers who attain Career Level II have the option of working the 11th month, and those who attain Level III have the option of working the 11th and 12th months.

Please respond to all statements using the following scale. **Where there are two response scales, please respond to both.** Circle your response to the right of each statement:

5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

		Respond for both groups.	
		Administrators	Teachers
2-1	Extended contracts are being effectively utilized to achieve instructional goals.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
2-2	Management of extended contracts is as simplified as possible for this type of program.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
2-3	The State Department of Education should provide closer monitoring of extended contracts.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
2-4	Career Ladder II or III educators should be the only ones eligible for extended contracts.	5 4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2 1
2-5	All 11-month and 12-month extended contract monies should be passed on to administrators.	5 4 3 2 1	
2-6	Attendance at the Administrators' Academy should count toward extended contract time for administrators.	5 4 3 2 1	

Section 3: POLICIES AND ISSUES

This section addresses various policies and issues concerning the Career Ladder program.

Please respond to all statements using the following scale. Circle only one response to the right of each statement:

5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

3-1	Educators who move to non-Career Ladder positions (e.g., principal to superintendent or teacher to central office position) should be able to maintain their Career Ladder supplements.	5 4 3 2 1
3-2	All administrators who are on the Career Ladder should be required to attend the Administrators' Academy.	5 4 3 2 1
3-3	All administrators who are NOT on the Career Ladder should be required to attend the Administrators' Academy.	5 4 3 2 1
3-4	Local school administrators should be responsible for evaluating and recommending their own teachers for Career Levels II and III.	5 4 3 2 1
3-5	Local school administrators should be a part of a State evaluation team for evaluating teachers for Career Levels II and III.	5 4 3 2 1
3-6	All certificated school personnel should be eligible to apply for the Career Ladder.	5 4 3 2 1
3-7	Years of experience should be a criterion for eligibility to obtain an upper level of the Career Ladder.	5 4 3 2 1
3-8	People in my community believe that Career Ladder is helping to improve the schools inTennessee.	5 4 3 2 1
3-9	Parents and community people prefer upper-level Career Ladder administrators in their schools.	5 4 3 2 1
3-10	Parents and community people prefer upper-level Career Ladder teachers in their schools.	5 4 3 2 1
3-11	Tennessee should return to a system in which pay increases are based on training and experience only, which excludes any incentive (merit) pay.	5 4 3 2 1

Section 4: CONTRIBUTIONS OF CAREER LADDER PROGRAM

This section asks for your perceptions of the contributions made by the Career Ladder Program to various educational variables. All aspects of this program should be considered, including staff development, the local and upper-level evaluations of teachers and administrators, and the extended contract program. For each variable, respond using the following scale. Circle only one response to the right of each item.

In my view, the Career Ladder has had the following effect on this variable:

5 = significant and positive
4 = somewhat positive
3 = no difference
2 = somewhat negative
1 = significant but negative

4-1	Student achievement	5 4 3 2 1
4-2	Public financial support	5 4 3 2 1
4-3	Professional growth	5 4 3 2 1
4-4	Classroom teaching	5 4 3 2 1
4-5	Building-level leadership	5 4 3 2 1
4-6	Teacher extended contract opportunities	5 4 3 2 1
4-7	Administrator extended contract opportunities	5 4 3 2 1
4-8	Retention of teachers in the profession	5 4 3 2 1

Section 5: INCENTIVE PROGRAMS

This section asks for your views on various incentive programs for teachers and administrators. Now we are asking you to rank order the programs listed below from "1" (your first preference) to "9" or "10" (your lowest preference). Please read all program descriptions before ranking.

Respond for both groups.

	Administrators	Teachers
5-1 GRANTS FOR SCHOOL-BASED PROJECTS (monies provided to schools for implementing programs or activities at the school level)		
5-2 GRANTS FOR INDIVIDUAL STAFF PROJECTS (monies provided to individual teachers or administrators for implementing programs, activities, ideas, etc.)		
5-3 CAREER LADDER PROGRAMS (monies provided for a combination of recognition and additional responsibilities such as mentoring and extra work)		
5-4 MERIT PAY (monies for individual recognition when no additional work is required to receive the monies)		
5-5 EXTENDED CONTRACTS (monies for additional work when selection is not necessarily based on any type of recognition)		
5-6 ACROSS-THE-BOARD SALARY INCREASES (monies provided for such things as years of experience, degrees, negotiations, etc., when determination of monies is applied consistently across all staff)		
5-7 SCHOOL-BASED INCENTIVES (monies provided to schools based upon such things as school improvement or school effectiveness when expending of monies is usually determined by the school. These programs may be thought of as merit pay for schools.)		
5-8 SABBATICAL LEAVE (programs where individuals may take a paid leave of absence for educationally related activities such as pursuing college degrees, exchange programs, etc.)		
5-9 RELEASE TIME (programs where individuals are able to leave during the work day for educationally related activities such as professional meetings, visitation of other classes, etc.)		
5-10 OTHER (please specify) _____		

Section 6: DEMOGRAPHICS

This section requests background information, which helps in the data analysis of this survey. Your anonymity will be preserved.

6-1 Sex: ____Female ____Male

6-2 Current administrative assignment (Please check one):

____K/Elementary ____Middle/Junior High

____High School ____Central Office

____Other (specify)_____

6-3 Position (Please check one):

____Principal

____Assistant Principal

____Superintendent

____Instructional Supervisor

____Other (specify)_____

6-4 Work setting (Please check one):

____Rural ____Small City

____Suburban ____Urban

6-5 Region of state (Please check one):

____East ____Middle ____West

6-6 Number of years of administrative experience:

_____

6-7 Number of years of experience in education:

_____

6-8 Certification status (Please check one):

____Provisional

____Career Level I

____Career Level II

____Career Level III

____Non-Career Ladder

____Other (specify)_____

6-9 Highest Career Ladder level for which you have been evaluated (Please check one):

____I ____II ____III ____Not Applicable

Thank you for your assistance. Please return this survey in the enclosed envelope by **November 30, 1987**, to:

Jo Gateley, Principal
Trezevant Vocational Technical Center
3224 Range Line Rd.
Memphis, Tennessee 38127

Phone: (901) 357-3565

Appendix C

Table A1 - Characteristics of Respondent Group

Variable	Category	n	%
Sex	Female	379	31.5
	Male	799	66.4
	Unknown	26	2.2
Current Administrative Assignment	K/Elementary	446	37.0
	Middle/Jr. High	116	9.6
	High School	150	12.5
	Central Office	342	28.4
	Other	117	9.7
	Unknown	33	2.7
Position	Principal	656	54.5
	Asst. Principal	36	3.0
	Superintendent	53	4.4
	Instr. Supervisor	230	19.1
	Other	201	16.7
	Unknown	28	2.3
Work Setting	Rural	542	45.0
	Small City	258	21.4
	Suburban	150	12.5
	Urban	219	18.2
	Unknown	35	2.9
Region of State	East	489	40.6
	Middle	389	32.3
	West	296	24.6
	Unknown	30	2.5
Years of Administrative Experience	1 - 5	230	19.1
	6 - 10	262	21.8
	11 - 15	276	22.9
	16 - 20	209	17.4
	More than 20	182	15.1
	Unknown	45	3.7
Years Experience in Education	1 - 5	9	0.7
	6 - 10	64	5.3
	11 - 15	169	14.0
	16 - 20	266	22.1
	More than 20	664	55.1
	Unknown	32	2.7
Career Ladder Status	Provisional	33	2.7
	Career Level I	550	45.7
	Career Level II	67	5.6
	Career Level III	380	31.6
	Non-Career Ladder	101	8.4
	Other	28	2.3
	Unknown	45	3.7
Highest Career Ladder for which have been evaluated	Level I	451	37.5
	Level II	45	3.7
	Level III	423	35.1
	Not applicable	201	16.7
	Unknown	84	7.0

Tables A.2 - Contributions of Career Ladder Program

Table A2.1 - Contributions of Career Ladder Program on: Student Achievement

Group	n	Percent Indicating Sign. Neg. 1	Some Neg. 2	No Diff. 3	Some Pos. 4	Sign. Pos. 5	Mean	SD
Total	1080	4	6	47	36	7	3.37	0.85
By Position								
Principal	598	3	6	48	36	7	3.38	0.83
Asst. Prin.	35	6	6	34	43	11	3.49	0.98
Superintendent	45	4	2	29	47	18	3.71	0.94
Instr. Super.	214	5	6	43	37	8	3.38	0.91
Other	174	3	7	57	30	2	3.22	0.74
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	87	6	7	52	28	8	3.25	0.92
Provisional	26	4	15	62	19	0	2.96	0.72
Career Ladder I	504	5	8	58	26	3	3.14	0.80
Career Ladder II	62	3	3	37	50	6	3.53	0.80
Career Ladder III	348	1	3	30	53	13	3.72	0.78
Other	24	0	8	58	33	0	3.25	0.61

Table A2.2 - Contributions of Career Ladder Program on: Public Financial Support

Group	n	Percent Indicating Sign. Neg. 1	Some Neg. 2	No Diff. 3	Some Pos. 4	Sign. Pos. 5	Mean	SD
Total	1080	4	10	40	36	10	3.37	0.94
By Position								
Principal	596	4	8	39	39	10	3.43	0.93
Asst. Prin.	35	9	9	26	34	23	3.54	1.20
Superintendent	45	4	7	42	36	11	3.42	0.94
Instr. Super.	215	5	12	41	31	11	3.32	0.98
Other	175	3	15	43	32	6	3.21	0.89
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	88	7	10	44	30	9	3.24	0.99
Provisional	26	8	23	38	23	8	3.00	1.06
Career Ladder I	505	5	13	47	32	3	3.16	0.87
Career Ladder II	62	5	10	32	42	11	3.45	0.99
Career Ladder III	347	3	5	29	43	19	3.70	0.94
Other	24	4	4	46	33	13	3.46	0.93

Table A2.3 - Contributions of Career Ladder Program on: Professional Growth

Group	n	Percent Indicating Sign. Neg. 1	Some Neg. 2	No Diff. 3	Some Pos. 4	Sign. Pos. 5	Mean	SD
Total	1081	3	8	24	47	18	3.69	0.96
By Position								
Principal	598	3	7	26	46	18	3.71	0.94
Asst. Prin.	35	0	11	26	46	17	3.69	0.90
Superintendent	45	7	7	13	40	33	3.87	1.16
Instr. Super.	214	4	7	17	51	20	3.76	1.00
Other	175	3	10	28	47	11	3.54	0.93
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	87	6	10	31	33	20	3.51	1.10
Provisional	26	12	19	15	50	4	3.15	1.16
Career Ladder I	506	4	11	32	44	7	3.39	0.94
Career Ladder II	62	0	6	8	63	23	4.02	0.76
Career Ladder III	348	1	2	12	51	34	4.16	0.76
Other	24	0	8	25	54	13	3.71	0.81

Table A2.4 - Contributions of Career Ladder Program on: Classroom Teaching

Group	n	Percent Indicating Sign. Neg. 1	Some Neg. 2	No Diff. 3	Some Pos. 4	Sign. Pos. 5	Mean	SD
Total	1081	4	11	34	41	10	3.41	0.96
By Position								
Principal	599	5	9	35	41	10	3.42	0.95
Asst. Prin.	35	3	17	14	54	11	3.54	1.01
Superintendent	45	4	7	27	33	29	3.76	1.09
Instr. Super.	214	4	10	31	43	12	3.48	0.97
Other	174	3	18	37	37	4	3.20	0.91
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	88	5	15	35	33	13	3.34	1.03
Provisional	26	8	23	50	15	4	2.85	0.92
Career Ladder I	505	7	14	44	32	4	3.13	0.94
Career Ladder II	62	3	10	23	56	8	3.56	0.90
Career Ladder III	348	1	5	20	55	19	3.85	0.82
Other	23	0	4	35	61	0	3.57	0.59

Table A2.5 - Contributions of Career Ladder Program on: Building-Level Leadership

Group	n	Percent Indicating Sign. Neg. 1	Some Neg. 2	No Diff. 3	Some Pos. 4	Sign. Pos. 5	Mean	SD
Total	1080	4	10	37	36	13	3.43	0.97
By Position								
Principal	596	3	10	37	36	14	3.47	0.96
Asst. Prin.	35	6	14	31	31	17	3.40	1.12
Superintendent	45	2	4	33	38	22	3.73	0.94
Instr. Super.	215	6	10	33	39	13	3.43	1.02
Other	175	4	13	41	37	5	3.25	0.89
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	88	6	6	49	31	9	3.32	0.93
Provisional	26	8	31	42	19	0	2.73	0.87
Career Ladder I	504	6	15	48	27	4	3.09	0.91
Career Ladder II	62	2	5	32	50	11	3.65	0.81
Career Ladder III	348	1	4	17	50	27	3.98	0.85
Other	24	0	13	38	50	0	3.38	0.71

Table A2.6 - Contributions of Career Ladder Program on: Teacher Extended Contract Opportunities

Group	n	Percent Indicating Sign. Neg. 1	Some Neg. 2	No Diff. 3	Some Pos. 4	Sign. Pos. 5	Mean	SD
Total	1081	3	7	12	51	27	3.92	0.97
By Position								
Principal	600	3	8	13	52	24	3.87	0.98
Asst. Prin.	35	6	6	14	63	11	3.69	0.96
Superintendent	45	7	0	11	42	40	4.09	1.06
Instr. Super.	213	3	4	8	48	37	4.11	0.95
Other	174	2	9	14	52	24	3.86	0.94
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	87	3	5	13	54	25	3.93	0.94
Provisional	26	4	15	15	50	15	3.58	1.06
Career Ladder I	504	5	10	17	54	14	3.62	1.00
Career Ladder II	61	2	0	8	57	33	4.20	0.73
Career Ladder III	350	1	3	4	45	47	4.33	0.81
Other	24	4	4	13	58	21	3.88	0.95

Table A2.7 - Contributions of Career Ladder Program on: Administrator Extended Contract Opportunities

Group	n	Percent Indicating Sign. Neg. 1	Some Neg. 2	No Diff. 3	Some Pos. 4	Sign. Pos. 5	Mean	SD
Total	1078	3	6	23	45	22	3.76	0.98
By Position								
Principal	597	4	6	23	45	21	3.73	1.00
Asst. Prin.	35	3	6	20	57	14	3.74	0.89
Superintendent	45	4	2	24	33	36	3.93	1.05
Instr. Super.	213	2	6	20	44	29	3.91	0.96
Other	174	2	9	29	46	15	3.64	0.90
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	88	2	2	31	48	17	3.75	0.85
Provisional	26	4	19	12	50	15	3.54	1.10
Career Ladder I	501	4	9	32	46	9	3.46	0.94
Career Ladder II	62	2	0	21	50	27	4.02	0.80
Career Ladder III	349	2	5	9	42	42	4.17	0.94
Other	23	4	4	39	39	13	3.52	0.95

Table A2.8 - Contributions of Career Ladder Program on: Retention of Teachers in the Profession

Group	n	Percent Indicating Sign. Neg. 1	Some Neg. 2	No Diff. 3	Some Pos. 4	Sign. Pos. 5	Mean	SD
Total	1080	12	19	44	19	6	2.88	1.04
By Position								
Principal	601	12	21	43	18	6	2.84	1.04
Asst. Prin.	35	23	17	40	14	6	2.63	1.17
Superintendent	44	7	14	45	27	7	3.14	0.98
Instr. Super.	213	12	16	43	22	7	2.96	1.07
Other	173	9	18	50	17	5	2.92	0.95
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	88	7	18	59	13	3	2.88	0.84
Provisional	26	27	19	42	12	0	2.38	1.02
Career Ladder I	505	17	24	44	11	3	2.58	0.99
Career Ladder II	62	2	27	39	24	8	3.10	0.95
Career Ladder III	348	5	12	40	31	11	3.32	1.00
Other	23	9	22	48	22	0	2.83	0.89

Tables A3 - Results for Retention of Administrator Career Ladder Evaluation Instruments

Table A3.1 - Instrument: Observation

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	1174	5	5	9	45	37	4.05	1.07
By Position								
Principal	643	4	4	8	48	36	4.10	0.96
Asst. Prin.	36	8	3	11	47	31	3.89	1.14
Superintendent	51	4	0	12	37	47	4.24	0.95
Instr. Super.	227	6	5	9	44	36	3.99	1.09
Other	192	7	6	11	38	39	3.95	1.17
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	96	4	3	8	39	46	4.19	1.01
Provisional	33	3	3	15	45	33	4.02	0.95
Career Ladder I	534	7	7	13	51	23	3.77	1.09
Career Ladder II	67	1	4	3	45	46	4.30	0.85
Career Ladder III	376	2	2	4	39	52	4.36	0.84
Other	26	8	8	12	35	38	3.88	1.24

Table A3.2 -Instrument: Interview

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	1172	4	5	9	50	32	4.02	0.96
By Position								
Principal	643	4	4	9	53	31	4.03	0.94
Asst. Prin.	36	3	8	8	58	22	3.89	0.95
Superintendent	51	4	2	10	41	43	4.18	0.97
Instr. Super.	225	2	7	10	46	36	4.06	0.96
Other	192	5	5	10	50	30	3.96	1.01
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	95	3	7	8	44	37	4.04	1.02
Provisional	32	3	0	13	53	31	4.09	0.86
Career Ladder I	537	5	5	12	55	23	3.85	1.00
Career Ladder II	67	4	3	7	48	37	4.10	0.99
Career Ladder III	374	1	4	5	47	43	4.26	0.82
Other	26	4	0	15	42	38	4.12	0.95

Table A3.3 - Instrument: Superordinate questionnaire

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	1174	5	5	11	46	32	3.96	1.05
By Position								
Principal	645	5	5	12	47	32	3.96	1.03
Asst. Prin.	36	0	14	6	53	28	3.94	0.95
Superintendent	52	2	2	8	44	44	4.27	0.84
Instr. Super.	227	6	3	8	46	37	4.04	1.06
Other	189	8	4	15	45	27	3.78	1.15
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	95	7	8	8	43	33	3.85	1.18
Provisional	33	9	6	27	45	12	3.45	1.09
Career Ladder I	537	8	5	13	50	25	3.78	1.11
Career Ladder II	67	6	1	7	46	39	4.10	1.07
Career Ladder III	375	2	3	7	43	45	4.26	0.85
Other	25	0	4	28	44	24	3.88	0.83

Table A3.4 - Instrument: Teacher questionnaire

Group	n	Percent Indicating: Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	1170	7	7	12	52	21	3.73	1.10
By Position								
Principal	641	7	7	11	53	23	3.79	1.07
Asst. Prin.	36	14	6	11	56	14	3.50	1.23
Superintendent	51	8	6	16	41	29	3.78	1.17
Instr. Super.	227	10	7	11	51	22	3.67	1.18
Other	190	5	7	17	54	17	3.70	1.00
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	96	7	7	16	46	24	3.72	1.13
Provisional	33	9	6	18	48	18	3.61	1.14
Career Ladder I	533	9	8	14	54	16	3.59	1.13
Career Ladder II	67	1	6	6	58	28	4.06	0.85
Career Ladder III	375	5	6	8	53	29	3.95	1.01
Other	25	4	12	24	52	8	3.48	0.96

Table A3.5 - Instrument: Writing test

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	1167	8	11	13	39	29	3.69	1.23
By Position								
Principal	641	9	10	12	40	29	3.69	1.23
Asst. Prin.	35	9	11	9	51	20	3.63	1.19
Superintendent	51	4	6	10	43	37	4.04	1.04
Instr. Super.	225	8	10	14	36	31	3.72	1.23
Other	191	8	13	15	38	26	3.61	1.23
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	93	9	15	12	34	30	3.62	1.29
Provisional	33	15	6	21	39	18	3.39	1.30
Career Ladder I	534	11	15	15	38	20	3.41	1.27
Career Ladder II	67	6	6	7	40	40	4.03	1.13
Career Ladder III	373	4	4	10	42	40	4.09	1.01
Other	26	12	12	12	38	27	3.58	1.33
By Sex								
Female	361	5	8	12	37	38	3.94	1.13
Male	784	10	12	13	41	24	3.58	1.25

Table A3.6 - Instrument: Reading test

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	1166	9	10	14	39	28	3.67	1.22
By Position								
Principal	640	9	10	14	40	26	3.64	1.24
Asst. Prin.	35	9	11	6	51	23	3.69	1.21
Superintendent	52	4	8	12	38	38	4.00	1.08
Instr. Super.	225	8	9	16	36	31	3.72	1.22
Other	190	8	11	16	38	26	3.64	1.22
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	94	10	14	12	35	30	3.62	1.30
Provisional	33	12	6	24	39	18	3.45	1.27
Career Ladder I	532	11	13	17	39	19	3.41	1.26
Career Ladder II	67	7	6	10	37	39	3.94	1.19
Career Ladder III	373	5	6	11	41	38	4.01	1.07
Other	26	12	12	12	38	27	3.58	1.33
By Sex								
Female	359	5	9	13	36	37	3.91	1.15
Male	785	10	11	15	41	23	3.56	1.24

Table A3.7 - Instrument: Professional Skills Test

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	1166	11	10	16	41	21	3.53	1.23
By Position								
Principal	641	11	10	17	41	21	3.50	1.24
Asst. Prin.	35	9	11	17	49	14	3.49	1.15
Superintendent	51	2	4	16	45	33	4.04	0.92
Instr. Super.	226	11	12	15	38	23	3.51	1.28
Other	189	11	10	15	44	20	3.54	1.22
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	94	12	6	12	48	22	3.63	1.24
Provisional	33	15	9	15	45	15	3.36	1.29
Career Ladder I	532	16	13	19	39	13	3.19	1.28
Career Ladder II	67	6	9	13	42	30	3.81	1.14
Career Ladder III	375	4	7	14	43	33	3.93	1.05
Other	24	4	4	25	46	21	3.75	0.99
By Sex								
Female	360	9	9	15	43	25	3.66	1.20
Male	784	11	11	17	41	20	3.47	1.24

Table A3.8 - Instrument: Student questionnaire

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	1165	20	20	17	31	12	2.95	1.34
By Position								
Principal	642	18	19	15	35	14	3.08	1.33
Asst. Prin.	36	28	17	14	33	8	2.78	1.40
Superintendent	51	14	24	24	25	14	3.02	1.27
Instr. Super.	222	27	25	16	23	10	2.65	1.36
Other	190	19	19	23	30	8	2.88	1.27
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	94	23	15	19	31	12	2.93	1.37
Provisional	33	18	15	15	36	15	3.15	1.37
Career Ladder I	534	22	22	17	29	9	2.81	1.32
Career Ladder II	67	21	12	19	34	13	3.07	1.36
Career Ladder III	371	16	20	15	35	15	3.13	1.33
Other	25	16	28	28	24	4	2.72	1.14

Table A3.9 - Instrument: Administrator's portfolio

Group	n	Percent Indicating Str. Disag. 1	Disag. 2	Neither 3	Agree 4	Str. Agree 5	Mean	SD
Total	1157	28	19	11	27	15	2.82	1.46
By Position								
Principal	632	28	20	11	26	16	2.80	1.47
Asst. Prin.	36	31	6	19	33	11	2.89	1.45
Superintendent	51	14	22	16	27	22	3.22	1.38
Instr. Super.	226	29	20	8	26	17	2.81	1.51
Other	188	24	19	14	34	9	2.84	1.36
By Career Ladder Status								
Non-Career Ladder	95	21	25	17	21	16	2.85	1.39
Provisional	32	31	6	31	25	6	2.69	1.33
Career Ladder I	529	37	26	11	20	6	2.31	1.32
Career Ladder II	66	26	9	12	41	12	3.05	1.43
Career Ladder III	371	15	11	9	37	29	3.53	1.39
Other	25	24	20	20	32	4	2.72	1.28
By Se:								
Female	361	24	17	10	32	17	3.02	1.47
Male	774	29	21	12	25	14	2.74	1.44